Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

http://www.archive.org/details/modernphilology05chicuoft

81

MODERN PHILOLOGY

708

EDITED BY
PHILIP S. ALLEN, *Managing Editor*
FREDERIC I. CARPENTER JEFFERSON B. FLETCHER

ADVISORY BOARD
JAMES W. BRIGHT FRANCIS B. GUMMERE
GEORGE HEMPL GEORGE L. KITTREDGE
JOHN E. MATZKE CALVIN THOMAS
FREDERICK M. WARREN

VOLUME FIVE
1907–1908

CHICAGO
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS
1908

96393
1/6/09

PB
1
M7
v. 5

Published
July 1907, October 1907
January 1908, April 1908

Composed and Printed By
The University of Chicago Press
Chicago, Illinois, U. S. A.

CONTENTS

GEORGE C. TAYLOR. The Relation of the English Corpus Christi Play to the Middle English Religious Lyric 1

JOHN J. MEYER. Hindu Chips for Readers of Goethe 39

OTTO MANTHEY-ZORN. Friedrich Heinrich Jacobi's Home at Pempelfort 43

H. OSKAR SOMMER. Galahad and Perceval. Part I 55

W. OWEN SYPHERD. Old French Influence on Middle English Phraseology 85

KARL PIETSCH. Notes on Spanish Folklore 97

HARLOW D. CURTIS. Source of the Petronel-Winifred Plot in Eastward Hoe 105

EDWARD SAPIR. Herder's Ursprung der Sprache 109

PAUL SHOREY. A Few Parallels from the Classics 143

HENRY N. MACCRACKEN. The Source of Keats's Eve of St. Agnes . . . 145

GEORGE F. REYNOLDS. Trees on the Stage of Shakespeare 153

MAX BATT. The German Story in England about 1826 169

MILTON A. BUCHANAN. Some Italian Reminiscences in Cervantes . . 177

H. OSKAR SOMMER. Galahad and Perceval. Part II 181

JOHN M. MANLY. Familia Goliae 201

JOHN E. MATZKE. The Lay of Eliduc and the Legend of the Husband with Two Wives 211

CHARLES G. OSGOOD, JR. Notes on Goldsmith 241

JEFFERSON B. FLETCHER. Did Astrophel Love Stella? 253

FRANCIS A. WOOD. Studies in Germanic Strong Verbs. Part II . . . 265

H. OSKAR SOMMER. Galahad and Perceval. Introduction, and Conclusion of Text 291

EDWIN H. TUTTLE. Three Asturian Poems 343

STARR W. CUTTING. Concerning Schiller's Treatment of Fate and Dramatic Guilt in His Braut von Messina 347

C. ALPHONSO SMITH. The Indicative in an Unreal Condition 361

GEORGE L. HAMILTON. Capados and the Date of Gawayne and the Green Knight 365

SAMUEL KROESCH. The Formation of Compound Words in Gothic . . 377

A. E. H. SWAEN. What if a Day 383

WILLIAM W. LAWRENCE. The Banished Wife's Lament 387

W. A. R. KERR. The Pleiade and Platonism 407

PHILIP S. ALLEN. Mediaeval Latin Lyrics. Part I 423

GEORGE T. NORTHUP. El Libro de los Gatos 477

WINIFRED SMITH. Italian and Elizabethan Comedy 555

CHARLES GOETTSCH. Ablaut-Relations in the Weak Verb in Gothic, Old High German, and Middle High German 569

D. L. THOMAS. Authorship of Revenge for Honour 617

Modern Philology

VOL. V *July, 1907* No. 1

THE RELATION OF THE ENGLISH CORPUS CHRISTI PLAY TO THE MIDDLE ENGLISH RELIGIOUS LYRIC

The historians of the English drama, in seeking to record its origin and development, have almost without exception failed to take notice of the Middle English religious lyric in its relation to the Corpus Christi plays. An occasional note, made at random from time to time, indicates, it is true, that certain writers have been aware that a relation of some sort exists between these two forms of Middle English literature. These notes, however, have for the most part concerned themselves with calling attention to very slight, though interesting, parallels. It is with such similarities, for example, that the observations of Wright,[1] Hone,[2] Courthope,[3] E. Mall,[4] and W. A. Craigie[5] have had to do. Davidson,[6] moreover, and Chambers[7] have taken notice in a very general fashion of the fact that the plays are very considerably indebted to the great body of devotional poetry of the day; while Cook[8] has called attention to the frequent occurrence of the *Testament of Christ* in Middle English literature.

One specific type of the mediaeval religious lyric, the *Planctus Mariae*, has for many years attracted considerable attention among

[1] *The Chester Plays*, Vol. II, p. 204 (Shakspere Society, Vol. I).
[2] *Ancient Mysteries Described*, pp. 90 ff.
[3] *History of English Poetry*, Vol. I, pp. 413 ff. [4] *The Harrowing of Hell.*
[5] *An English Miscellany*, pp. 52 ff. [6] *Studies in the English Mystery Plays*, p. 170.
[7] *The Mediaeval Stage*, Vol. II, pp. 145 ff. [8] *The Christ of Cynewulf*, pp. 207 ff.

European scholars and its relation to the drama has been fairly clearly determined.[1] The other numerous lyric types, most of which, like the planctus, seem to have had their origin in the Latin,[2] and some of which, like the planctus, have spread through Europe, have been, so far as I can learn, almost entirely ignored. Taken collectively, these forms doubtless contributed far more extensively to the growth of the cyclic plays in Europe than did the planctus, and one of these types alone, *The Testament of Christ* or *The Complaint of Christ to his People*, probably had an effect, all but as important as that of the planctus itself, on the growth and expansion of the passion-play.

It was at the suggestion of Professor Manly that I began several years ago to investigate the relation of the general body of lyric poetry in Middle English to the Corpus Christi plays. The field proved fertile. Indeed, so numerous are the types of the lyric which have contributed to the formation of the Corpus Christi plays, and so numerous are the examples which go to make up certain of these types,[3] that I found it necessary for the time being to limit the thoroughgoing investigation to one special type, the *Planctus Mariae*.[4] From a general survey of the field, however, I have been able to arrive at results certain and definite enough to warrant some sort of a statement, and this paper will have attained its object if it succeeds in putting forward some of the more important of the types of the Middle English religious lyric upon which the writers and compilers of the miracle-plays have drawn most freely and extensively.

It will be unnecessary to enter here into an elaborate discussion of the meaning of the term "lyric;" but inasmuch as many of the poems to which reference will be made are not lyrical in any ordinary modern sense, it may be well to say that I have classed as

[1] For references, see "The English *Planctus Mariae*," *Modern Philology*, Vol. IV, pp. 605 ff. A thesis by Thien, *Über die englischen Marienklagen*, was published several months before my article on the *Planctus* appeared. My article, which had been in the hands of the editors of *Modern Philology* for almost two years, was being printed when I secured a copy of Thien's thesis.

[2] Unfortunately, during the last few months, *Analecta hymnica* (Dreves) has been inaccessible to me. It doubtless contains many other Latin prototypes of the Middle English lyrics than those which I cite in this paper.

[3] *The Testament of Christ* and *The Hail Mary*.

[4] See "The English *Planctus Mariae*," *Modern Philology*, Vol. IV, pp. 605 ff.

lyric any verse which either in metrical form or in emotional motive seemed in any sense to belong to the lyric categories. I have listed many prayers which are very slightly lyrical, if lyrical at all in any sense, and very occasionally I have paused to comment incidentally upon didactic types such as the *Ten Commandments*.

Perhaps the non-dramatic type most frequently incorporated into the plays is the general prayer addressed, as the occasion may serve, to God the Father, Christ the Son, and very frequently also to the Virgin Mary. There are thousands of these prayers to be found in the devotional poetry of the day, and hundreds in the plays.[1] It is fairly certain that many of these were taken over as ready-made lyrics by the play-writers and adapted to dramatic purposes. Thus the celebrated mediaeval Latin hymn, *Veni creator, spiritus*,[2] seems to have been taken over bodily by Chester in *The Emission of the Holy Ghost*,[3] and probably has escaped notice up to the time, mainly because it is so abominably translated.[4] Of the prayers to Christ[5] two types especially have exerted a very marked and definite influence upon the drama. Of both types there are scores in Middle English literature. The one is

[1] *Chester Plays* (ed. Thomas Wright, Shaks. Soc., Vol. I), Vol. I, pp. 97, 162; Vol. II, pp. 159, 160, 179; *York Mystery Plays* (ed. Miss Lucy Toulmin Smith), pp. 3, 36, 61, 100, 108, 433; *The Towneley Plays* (ed. A. W. Pollard, EETS), pp. 3, 23, 40, 99, 195; *Coventry Mysteries* (ed. J. O. Halliwell, Shaks. Soc., Vol. II), pp. 40, 49, 57, 104, 380. For examples of prayers of a somewhat similar nature, see *Minor Poems of the Vernon MS* (EETS), Vol. I, pp. 26, 145, 149, 355; *An Old English Miscellany* (EETS), p. 100; *Religious Pieces* (EETS), p. 59; *Eng. Stud.*, Vol. IX, p. 49; *Anglia*, Vol. I, p. 67; *Specimens of Lyric Poetry* (Percy Soc., Vol. IV), p. 49; *Richard Rolle of Hampole* (ed. Horstmann, "Yorkshire Writers"), Vol. I, pp. 363 ff.; *Bannatyne MS* (pr. for the Hunterian Club), Vol. I, pp. 84, 107.

[2] See *Das deutsche Kirchenlied* (Wackernagel), Vol. I, p. 75. See further, *Minor Poems of V. MS*, Vol. I, p. 43; *Hymni Latini* (Mone), Vol. I, pp. 241 ff.

[3] *Chester*, Vol. II, pp. 127 ff. In the Hegge *Mary's Betrothment* (p. 93), the stage directions order the singing of this hymn, but the existing text does not contain it. In the York *Descent of the Holy Spirit* (p. 469), we are told that the angels sang this hymn to Mary.

[4] See for dramatic customs in connection with the hymn, Chambers, *The Med. Stage*, Vol. II, p. 66. See for parallels, Appendix of the present discussion, pp. 16 f.

[5] *Chester*, Vol. II, pp. 99, 101 ff.; *York*, pp. 177, 212, 368, 424 ff., 504; *Town.*, pp. 325 ff., 340 ff.; *Cov.*, pp. 223, 356, 403. For prayers to Christ of various kinds, see *Minor Poems of the V. MS*, Vol. I, pp. 37, 45, 48, 131 ff., 154, 332; Vol. II, 449, 451, 464 ff.; *Richard Rolle of Hampole* ("Yorkshire Writers"), Vol. I, pp. 72 ff., 363 ff.; *William of Shoreham* (EETS), pp. 79 ff.; *Gude and Godlie Ballatis* (Scot. T. Soc.), pp. 21, 24, 62, 64, 73 ff.; *The Poems of Dunbar*, Vol. II (Scot. T. Soc.), p. 65; *Political, Religious and Love Poems*, re-ed., Furnivall (EETS), pp. 123 ff.; *Anglia*, Vol. V, Anzeiger, p. 119; Vol. XII, p. 595; *Eng. Stud.*, Vol. VIII, pp. 255 ff.; Vol. X, pp. 232 ff.; *Herrigs Archiv*, Vol. XCVIII, p. 129.

the prayer of a repentant sinner, lamenting his past offenses;[1] the other consists of that class of prayers in which the sufferings and bodily wounds of Jesus are recounted in detail as cause for lamentation.[2] No single motive in the devotional poetry of the day seems to have been turned to literary uses so frequently and no motive enables the writers of the time to rise to more fervid and more moving heights of lyric poetry. It would seem that this motive has been taken over from the *Testament of Christ* poems, which will be considered at some length below. An exceptionally conventional form of these lyrical prayers is characterized both in the plays and in the independent lyrics by the initial phrase "When I think."[3] Another very conventional passage which occurs in these prayers to Jesus and has made its way from the lyric over to the drama is characterized by the constant repetition of the phrase "Mercy Jesus."[4]

Perhaps the most highly conventional of all the conventional forms of address to Christ is the *Hail Jesus*, a prayer in which oftentimes almost every line begins with this formula, followed by synonyms indicating in a fashion the different qualities and characteristics of the Savior. There are numerous examples of this

[1] *Chester*, Vol. II, pp. 6, 180 ff., 192 ff.; *York*, pp. 30 ff., 39, 138, 174, 311; *Town.*, pp. 343, 351 ff.; *Minor Poems of the V. MS.*, Vol I, pp. 48 ff.; Vol. II, pp. 696, 785 ff.; *Rich. R. of Hampole*, Vol. I, pp. 74 ff., 368 ff.; *Polit., Relig. and Love Poems*, pp. 123 ff., *Hymns to V.* and *C.* (EETS), pp. 95 ff.; *Reliquiae Antiquae*, Vol. I, pp. 261 ff.; Vol. II, pp. 119 ff., 190 ff., 226; *Anglia*, Vol. XXVI, pp. 157, 160. The cries of lost souls who are being carried away to hell might very well be considered in connection with the prayers of the repentant sinners, but more fittingly deserve consideration in connection with the many lyrical poems which have found their way into the judgment-plays, which I consider below.

[2] In the plays these lyrics in the majority of cases are characterized by some one of the stanzas or lines beginning with the word "Alas!" Sometimes also this is the case with the independent lyrics. See further, *Chester*, Vol. II, pp. 53, 95, 101; *York*, pp. 260, 341 ff., 406 ff., 410, 421 ff., 456, 480 ff.; *Town.*, pp. 277, 316 ff., 325 ff., 358; *Cov.*, pp. 316, 331, 355 ff., 360; *Minor Poems of the V. MS.*, Vol. I, pp. 29, 37, 47, 302, 384, 404, 425 ff.; Vol. II, pp. 452 ff., 471 ff.; *Legends of the Holy Rood* (EETS), pp. 150, 194 ff., 217 ff., 222; *Rich. R. of Hampole*, Vol. I, pp. 76 ff., 369 ff.; *William of Shoreham's Poems* (EETS), pp. 79 ff.; *Spec. of Lyric Poetry* (Percy Soc., Vol. IV), pp. 62 ff., 83, 86, 111 ff.; *Eng. Stud.*, Vol. VII, pp. 454, 468; Vol. IX, p. 45; *Anglia*, Vol. XII, pp. 595 ff.; Vol. XXVI, pp. 263 ff.; *An Old Eng. Misc.*, pp. 38, 140, 197; *The Bann. MS.*, Vol. I, pp. 77, 85, 90, 103, 106. Especially interesting is the passage of this kind to be found in *The Lamentation of Mary Magdalene* (ed. Bertha M. Skeat), as the same kind of passage is so frequently put into her mouth in the miracle-plays. See further *Hymni Latini* (Mone), Vol. 1, pp. 121 ff., 131 ff., 392 ff.

[3] *York*, p. 452, l. 116; *Town.*, pp. 316, 327, 328; *Spec. of Lyric Poetry* (Percy Soc., Vol. IV), p. 83; *Rich. R. of Hampole*, Vol. I, p. 78; *Hymni Latini* (Mone), Vol. I, pp. 415 ff. For parallels, see Appendix, pp. 17 f.

[4] *York*, pp. 424, 489; *Town.*, p. 351; *Herrigs Archiv*, Vol. CVI, pp. 60 f. For parallel passages, see Appendix, pp. 29 f.

form in the drama; it appears most frequently in the Christmas plays and constitutes a very large portion of the body of the play in Chester, York, and Towneley.[1] It may possibly not be amiss to consider as variations of the above lyrical form the *Welcome* and *Farewell* lyrics sometimes addressed to Jesus, sometimes to Mary, in which "Welcome" or "Farewell" are substituted for "Hail;" they seem to be modeled throughout upon the *Hail* poems.[2] Very similar in form and general treatment to the *Hail Jesus* is the *Hail Mary*.[3] Serving about the same purpose in the plays is the prayer which begins with "Come" instead of "Hail,"[4] and which very probably belongs to the class of Latin lyrics represented by *Veni praecelsa domina*.[5] The *Hail* lyrics and their variations may all have been the development of one line in the annunciation-lyrics, spoken by Gabriel, "Hail Mary."[6]

[1] *Chester*, Vol. I, pp. 140 ff., 167 ff.; *York*, pp. 114 ff., 135 ff., pp. 216 ff., 444 ff.; *Town.*, pp. 114 ff., 139 ff., 157 ff.; *Cov.*, pp. 158 ff., 168 ff. See also *Rich. R. of Hampole*, Vol. I, pp. 78 ff.; *Minor Poems of the V. MS*, Vol. I, pp. 24 ff.; Lydgate's *Nightingale and Other Poems* (ed. Glauning, EETS), pp. 26 ff.; *The Bann. MS*, Vol. I, pp. 72 ff., 84 ff. See further, *Hymni Latini* (Mone), Vol. I, pp. 156 ff. See Appendix, p. 18.

[2] The *Welcome* lyrics are to be found in *Chester*, Vol. I, pp. 194 ff.; Vol. II, pp. 2 ff.; *York*, pp. 443, 489; *Cov.*, pp. 176, 347; *The Pageant of the Shearmen and Taylors* (Manly, *Pre-S. Dr.*), ll. 699 ff. See also for this form of address applied to persons other than Christ, *The Digby Plays* (ed. Furnivall, EETS), pp. 18, 128. They are to be found as independent lyrics in *The Minor Poems of Lydgate* (Percy Soc., Vol. II), p. 10; *Christmas Carols* (Percy Soc., Vol. IV), pp. 4, 53, 57; *Songs and Carols* (Percy Soc., Vol. XXIII), p. 43; *The Bann. MS*, Vol. I, p. 255. The specimen printed in Percy Soc., Vol. XXIII, p. 43, suggests that this class of lyrics may have had its origin in some of the pagan Germanic folk-customs.

The *Farewell* lyrics are to be found in *Chester*, Vol. I, p. 171; *York*, pp. 447, 487; *Town.*, p. 203; *Cov.*, pp. 102, 143, 160, 347. See *The Lamentation of Mary Magdalene*, ed. Bertha M. Skeat. See also *Songs and Carols* (Percy Soc., Vol. XXIII), p. 57, and *The Bann. MS*, Vol. II, pp. 645 ff., where it is used as a form of address to others than Christ. See for parallel passages, Appendix, pp. 19 ff.

[3] *York*, pp. 473, 484 ff., 492; *Cov.*, pp. 176, 387, 389, 391; *Minor Poems of the V. MS*, Vol. I, pp. 49 ff., 121 ff.; *Polit., Relig. and Love Poems* (1st ed., EETS), pp. 81 ff., 145 ff., 174 ff.; *Wm. of Shoreham* (EETS), pp. 127 ff.; *Hymns to V. and C.*, pp. 4 ff.; *Songs and Carols* (Percy Soc., Vol. XXIII), p. 80; *Chaucerian and Other Poems* (ed. Skeat), p. 275; *Rel. Ant.*, Vol. II, pp. 174; *Anglia*, Vol. XXVI, pp. 164 ff.; Vol. XXVII, pp. 321 ff.; *Herrigs Archiv*, Vol. LXXXIX, pp. 183 ff. For the use of this lyric as a form of address to characters other than Christ and Mary, see *The Digby Plays*, pp. 69, 103 ff., 126 ff. For French forms see Gröber, *Grundriss der romanischen Philologie*, Vol. II. Part I, pp. 974 ff. For Latin lyrics of this type see *Das deutsche Kirchenlied* (Wackernagel), Vol. I, pp. 125 ff., 169 ff., 172 ff., 190 ff.; *Hymni Latini* (Mone), Vol. II, pp. 5 ff.

[4] *York*, pp. 445, 484.

[5] *Das deutsche Kirch.* (Wackernagel), Vol. I, p. 246; *Hymni Latini* (Mone), Vol. II, pp. 125 f.; see also *Hymni Latini*, Vol. I, p. 247, and *Piae Cantiones* (Klemming), p. 176. See Appendix, p. 21.

[6] See the Latin lyric, *Das deutsche Kirch.*, Vol. I, p. 116; see English lyrics, *An Old Eng. Misc.*, p. 100; *Minor Poems of V. MS*, Vol. I, p. 4; *Eng. Stud.*, Vol. XIV, p. 401; *Chester*, Vol. I, p. 94; *York*, p. 98; *Town.*, p. 88; *Cov.*, p. 112.

Of the general prayers and hymns to Mary there are in the poetry of the day thousands,[1] and in the drama some few.[2] It is especially interesting to find, however, that two of the most highly conventionalized of all the hymns to Mary have worked their way into the plays. The one is the lyric which plays fancifully with the individual letters of Mary's name;[3] the other is one of the most facetious and popular of the religious lyrics current during the Middle Ages, *The Five Joys of Mary*, sometimes also written in the form, *The Seven, Nine, and Fifteen Joys of Mary*. It is in the form of the *Five Joys* that it is found in the *York Plays*.[4] This form of the lyric, however, affected the drama most extensively when at Brussels it was given the dignity of a separate play.[5]

Of the many types of prayers and complaints in Middle English none is characterized by a more peculiar and striking tone than that in which the prayer is made to suit the especial needs of an old man.[6] In these lyrics the speaker sometimes laments the sins of his youth, complains of his decrepit condition, and describes in detail the physical decay which accompanies old age. Many of these are of the nature of dramatic monologues and

[1] See *Das deutsche Kirch.*, Vol. I, pp. 47, 82, 109 ff.; *Rel. Ant.*, Vol. I, pp. 22, 89, 102, 169, 235, 274; Vol. II, pp. 120, 212, 228 ff.; *Anglia*, Vol. XXVI, p. 190.

[2] *York*, pp. 101, 476, 492, 494 ff.; *Cov.*, pp. 116, 128, 154. Professor Manly has suggested that many more were present at one time in the body of the plays, but that most of them were cut out at the time when Mary-worship fell into disfavor in England.

[3] See *Cov.*, p. 88; *Herrigs Archiv*, Vol. CIX, p. 64; *Hymni Latini* (Mone), Vol. II, pp. 94 f. See also the prayer to Jesus (Percy Soc., Vol. II, p. 278). See for parallel passages, Appendix, p. 29.

[4] Pp. 493 ff. See also for Latin forms, *Das deutsche Kirch.*, Vol. I, pp. 150 ff.; *Hymni Latini* (Mone), Vol. II, pp. 161 ff.; *Rich. R. of Hamp.*, Vol. I, pp. 408 ff.; and for English forms, *Minor Poems of V. MS*, Vol. I, pp. 25 ff., 31 ff., 133 ff.; *Wm. of Shoreham*, pp. 117; *An Old Eng. Misc.*, p. 87; *Spec. of Lyric Poetry* (Percy Soc., Vol. IV), pp. 54 ff., 94 ff.; *Christmas Carols* (P. Soc., Vol. IV), pp. 7 f.; *Songs and Carols* (P. Soc., Vol. XXIII), pp. 68 ff.; Böddeker, *Altenglische Dichtung*, p. 218; *Anglia*, Vol. XXVI, pp. 164, 226, 232, 242, 257; *Rel. Ant.*, Vol. I, p. 48; Mätzner's *Altenglische Sprachproben*, pp. 51; *Herrigs Archiv*, Vol. LXXXIX, pp. 275, 282; Vol. CIX, pp. 48, 49; *Cursor Mundi* (EETS), Parts V, VI, p. 1468. See further Gröber, *Grundriss der romanischen Philologie*, p. 973. For parallel passages, see Appendix, p. 22.

[5] Creizenach, Vol. I, p. 340; Chambers, Vol. II, p. 87.

[6] *Rel. Ant.*, Vol. I, pp. 119, 197; Vol. II, p. 210; *Hymns to V. and C.*, pp. 36, 83; *Anglia*, Vol. III, p. 279; *The Minor Poems of Lydgate* (Percy Soc., Vol. II), pp. 240, 254; *Spec. of Relig. Poetry* (P. Soc., Vol. IV), p. 47; *Bann. MS*, Vol. II, pp. 457, 781; *The Poetical Works of Skelton* (ed. Dyce), Vol. I, pp. 2 ff. Sometimes the passage simply describes the condition of the body in old age, without taking the form of a complaint. See *The Minor Poems of Lydgate* (Percy Soc., Vol. II), p. 30; *The Pricke of Conscience* (ed. R. Morris), p. 22; *Hymns to V. and C.*, p. 79; *Minor Poems of Vernon MS*, Vol. II, pp. 446 ff.; *Twenty-six Polit. Poems* (EETS), p. 138. The best known of these is perhaps "Maximon," *Rel. Ant.*, Vol. I, pp. 119 ff.; pr. also in *Anglia*, Vol. III, pp. 279 ff., and in Böddeker, *Alteng. Dicht.*, pp. 244 ff.

readily adapt themselves to dramatic treatment. It is difficult to read the speeches of characters in the plays, such as Noah, Joseph, and Simeon, without feeling that they were in a very definite sense influenced by these complaints.[1] And the humorous treatment of Joseph in the Corpus Christi plays, especially in Chester and Coventry,[2] may, in fact, be due to the eternal ridiculing of old men with young wives in the semi-religious lyrics.[3]

Middle English poetry contains an exceedingly rich body of Christmas songs.[4] One might expect to find that these had exerted a considerable influence upon the English Christmas plays. And there are, it is true, a few fragments of what may have once been Christmas lyrics.[5] But if there were ever complete lyrics at the beginnings of the English shepherds plays, or at those points in the plays where the angels first address the shepherds—points at which we might expect to find them—they have been crowded out by material of another sort. In *The Pageant of the Shearmen and Taylors*, there are, of the three songs appended at the end, two, Nos. I and III, which bear unmistakable evidence of being Christmas lyrics.[6] There is also another Christmas lyric which very evidently resembles those portions of the Christmas plays in which the shepherds make their offerings to Christ.[7] In this case, however, it is the lyric which has been influenced by the miracle plays, rather than the reverse.

[1] *Chester*, Vol. I, pp. 98, 139, 189; *York*, pp. 43, 102, 138, 436; *Town.*, pp. 25, 161, 181 ff.; *Cov.*, pp. 96, 118; see also *Nice Wanton*, Manly's *Pre-S. Dr.*, Vol. I, ll. 260 ff., for the same type of speech in the mouth of an old woman. For parallel passages, see Appendix, pp. 22 ff.

[2] *Chester*, Vol. I, pp. 98, 138 ff.; *Cov.*, pp. 117 ff., 131 ff., 145 ff.

[3] *Christmas Carols* (Percy Soc., Vol. IV), p. 52; Hone's *Ancient Mysteries*, pp. 90 ff. See for the treatment of this theme in the fourth-century Greek homiletic writings, Cook, *Journal of Germanic Philology*, Vol. IV, pp. 421 ff.

[4] See *Christmas Carols* (Percy Soc., Vol. IV); *Songs and Carols* (Percy Soc., Vol. XXIII); *Anglia*, Vol. XXVI, pp. 189, 196, 231, 235, 253, 260, 265, 268, 271, 274, 279. A complete list of them would make a small-sized book of bibliography in itself. See also, for numerous Latin songs of much the same sort, *Das deutsche Kirchenlied*, Vol. I, pp. 198 ff.

[5] Town. *Shepherd's Play*, I, ll. 295 ff.; II, ll. 638 ff.; *The Adoration of the Shepherds*, ll. 1-13. See also *The Pageant of the Shearmen and Taylors* (Manly, *Pre-S. D.*), ll. 435 ff.

[6] Manly, *Pre-S. Drama*, Vol. I, pp. 151 ff.; ed. also by Craig, *Two Coventry Corpus Christi Plays* (EETS), p. 32. Compare with No. I, *Rel. Ant.*, Vol. II, p. 76; for the same carol see also *Songs and Carols* (Percy Soc., Vol. XXIII), p. 12, and *Anglia*, Vol. XXVI, pp. 250 ff.; compare with No. III the lyric No. LXXIII of the Baliol MS, 354, *Anglia*, Vol. XXVI, pp. 237 ff. See Appendix, p. 23, for parallels.

[7] *Anglia* Vol. XXVI, pp. 243 ff., Poem No. LXXXII, stanzas 7, 8, 9. See Appendix, pp. 23 ff., for parallels.

Almost as widespread as the *Christmas Carol*, and far more uniform in its type, is the *Testament of Christ*, termed variously the *Lament of the Redeemer*, *Christ's Charter*, and *Christ's Complaint.*[1] Here again, as in the case of the *Complaints of an Old Man*, we have an instance of a lyrical form which is in itself essentially of the nature of a dramatic monologue; and the treatment of this theme in the drama and in the independent poems differs scarcely at all, the independent poems sometimes, it is true, growing to far larger proportions than they ever do in the drama. It seems highly probable that in many cases the independent lyric has been inserted into the drama with little or no change. In Towneley[2] this, it would seem, has certainly happened. Skelton's lyric on the same theme,[3] if Skelton's it may be called, is almost word for word and rhyme for rhyme similar to Towneley. It is difficult to say how much this form had to do with the growth and development of the passion-plays. Historians of the drama have had so much to say about the *Planctus Mariae* in its relation to the passion-plays that they have failed to take special notice of this lyrical form, about as widespread and popular in the Middle Ages as the *planctus*, if not more so. The form, however, may have had more to do with the initial stages of development of the passion-play than it is given credit for. It is barely pos-

[1] Cook, in *The Christ of Cynewulf*, pp. 208 ff., called attention to the frequent occurrence of this form in English and in other literatures, citing at the same time examples of its occurrence in the miracle-plays and inquiring into its origin. I add the following references: *Chester*, Vol. II, pp. 190 ff.; *York*, pp. 363, 423, 450, 454; *Town.*, pp. 265 ff., 341; *Cov.*, pp. 207, 325, 329, 346; *Minor Poems of V. MS.*, Vol. I, pp. 259, 435; Vol. II, 462, 625, 659; *Pricke of Conscience*, pp. 141, 145; *An Old Eng. Misc.* (EETS), pp. 81, 231; *Herrigs Archiv*, Vol. CVI, pp. 53, 62 (similar to version by Skelton, pp. 141 ff.), 69 ff.; *Cursor Mundi*, pp. 1644 ff.; *Polit., Relig. and Love Poems* (re-ed. by Furnivall for EETS), pp. 141 ff., 182 ff., 190 ff., 254 ff., 262 ff., 276 ff.; *Hymns to V. and C.* (EETS), pp. 124 ff.; *The Lamentation of Souls* (ed. Lumby with *Be Domes Daege*) ll. 35 ff. (EETS); *Twenty-six Polit. Poems* (EETS), pp. 41 ff., 76 ff., 85 ff.; *The Minor Poems of Lydgate* (Percy Soc., Vol. II), pp. 259 ff.; *Songs and Carols* (P. Soc., Vol. XXIII), pp. 19 ff., 46; *Wyt and Science and Early Poetical Miscellanies* (Shaks. Soc., Vol. II), pp. 68 ff.; *Bann. MS.*, Vol. I, pp. 82 ff., 96, 103, 112 ff.; Lydgate's *Two Nightingale Poems* (EETS), pp. 21 ff.; *Poetical Works of Skelton*, Vol. I, pp. 141, 144; *The Assumption of our Lady* (re-ed. by G. H. McKnight, EETS), pp. 123 ff.; *Eng. Stud.*, Vol. XXI, pp. 207 ff.; *Rel. Ant.*, Vol. II, pp. 119, 225; *Anglia*, Vol. III, pp. 550 ff.; Vol. XXVI, pp. 246, 248 ff., 255; *Alteng. Dicht.* (Böddeker), pp. 271 ff.; *The New Nut Brown Maid* ("Early Popular Poetry," ed. Hazlitt, Vol. III), pp. 2 ff.; *Rich. R. of Hampole*, Vol. I, p. 88; Vol. II, pp. 16 ff., 457 ff. See also Thien, *Über die englischen Marienklagen* (Kiel, 1906), p. 82. Compare *Hymni Latini* (Mone), Vol. I, pp. 396 f., and also *Carmina Burana* (Schmeller, 1904), p. 29.

[2] *The Resurrection of the Lord*, ll. 262 ff.

[3] *The Poetical Works of Skelton* (ed. Dyce), Vol. I, pp. 144 ff. See Appendix, pp. 26 ff., for parallel passages.

sible that it is to some form of this Lament that de Douhet refers when seeking to explain the origin of the passion-play.[1] In the English passion-play there is no more evidence that the *planctus* was the germ or starting-point of the passion-plays than there is for the *Christ's Testament.*[2] In the German Tyrol[3] and Alsfelder[4] passion-plays this passage follows very closely the Latin hymn form, in which is found the First Lesson for the First Nocturn for Good Friday.[5] In both cases, moreover, the initial lines are in the original Latin, as if at one time the entire Latin hymn had had its place in the earliest passion-plays. So far as I have been able to discover, it seems by no means certain that the *planctus* was dramatized any earlier than the *Testament of Christ.*

Any investigation of the resurrection-lyrics, some of which are still retained in many of the miracle-plays[6] which treat the events following the crucifixion, would naturally lead us back to the question of the liturgical origins of the Easter-play. With that question this paper is not directly concerned. There are, however, some few of these lyrics in the plays which may be the result of the playwrights having drawn upon the English independent resurrection-lyrics,[7] rather than the result of the retention and gradual development of the original resurrection-hymns of the liturgical drama.

From the point of view of today those lyrics which deal with the general theme of the *Life of Man*[8] in a semi-secular, semi-

[1] *Dictionnaire des mystères*, pp. 633 ff.

[2] See "The English *Planctus Mariae*," *Modern Philology*, Vol. IV, pp. 632 ff.

[3] Wackernell, *Altdeutsche Passionsspiele aus Tirol*, pp. 127 ff.

[4] *Deutsche Nat.-Litteratur*, "Das Drama des Mittelalters," Vol. III, pp. 764 ff.

[5] For other places in which it is employed in the Sarum Use, see Cook, *The Christ of Cynewulf*, p. 208.

[6] *York*, p. 424; *Town.*, pp. 324, 344 ff., 355 ff., 362; *Cov.*, pp. 348, 356 ff., 362 ff., 367 ff., 371 ff., 375 ff.

[7] *The Gude and Godlie Ballatis*, pp. 47; *The Bann. MS*, Vol. I, pp. 93, 95. For poems of the same kind with refrains as in *Cov.*, pp. 375 ff., see *The Bann. MS*, pp. 92 ff.; *Polit., Relig. and Love Poems* (EETS), pp. 210 ff.; *Chester*, Vol. II, "Notes," pp. 204 ff. The last three examples are in reality *Planctus Mariae* influenced in form by the resurrection-lyric. For examples of Latin lyrics of a somewhat similar type, see Wackernagel, *Das deutsche Kirchenlied*, Vol. I, pp. 175 ff., 218, 242 ff.

[8] For lyrics of this general type, see *Lydgate's Minor Poems* (Percy Soc., Vol. II), pp. 74 ff., 198; *Spec. of Lyric Poetry* (P. Soc., Vol. IV), pp. 23, 47, 60, 101; *Religious Songs* (P. Soc., Vol. XI), pp. 64 ff.; *Songs and Carols* (P. Soc., Vol. XXIII), pp. 4 ff.; *Rel. Ant.*, Vol. I, pp. 26, 138, 160, 234, 235, 261; *The Minor Poems of Lydgate* (P. Soc., Vol. II), pp. 20, 166, 177, 229; *Early Pop. Poetry*, Vol. III, p. 40; *Bann. MS*, Vol. I, pp. 37, 55, 127 ff., 131, 137, 152 ff., 155 ff., 201, 209 ff.,

religious tone are by far the most interesting of all the various classes with which we are concerned in this discussion. The writers of Middle English verse never tire of discoursing about the briefness, the changeableness of life, the transitoriness and worthlessness of all earthly things, often stopping to describe in detail the repulsiveness of the human body, and almost as often, using this text as a sermon, ending the poem by calling upon us to amend our lives and repent while there is yet time. The best-known and, in a literary way, the most effective form of this lyric is the *Ubi Sunt*, immortalized by Villon and Thomas de Hales, in which the writer inquires where the great and famous of the world are all gone. With this lyric we are not concerned here; its influence on the Corpus Christi play is hardly to be detected, though it later makes its appearance in Skelton's *Magnyfycence*, later still at the end of *The Disobedient Child*, and finally in Shakespeare's *Richard III*.[1] Other types of the *Life of Man* lyric have, however, exercised an influence upon these plays which, though slight, is marked and striking. In the Towneley *Shepherd Plays*[2] appears the form which emphasizes the variableness of life in the conventional phrases, "Now in, now out;"[3] in the Towneley *Shepherd's Play, II*,[4] the briefness of life is especially emphasized.[5] In the Towneley *Judgment*[6] there is a suggestion of the *Ubi Sunt* which calls to mind rather the Anglo-Saxon[7] form than

308, 321, 329; Vol. II, pp. 759 ff.; *Anglia*, Vol. I, pp. 285, 291; Vol. II, p. 71; Vol. XXVI, pp. 141 ff., 158, 167, 185, 197 ff., 207; *Minor Poems of V. MS* (EETS), Vol. I, pp. 335, 343; Vol. II, pp. 512, 667, 672, 674 ff., 686, 692, 715, 726 ff., 730, 740 ff.; *Polit., Relig. and Love Poems* (re-ed. EETS), pp. 255, 263; *Twenty-six Polit. Poems* (EETS), p. 113; *Wm. of Shoreham* (EETS), p. 1; *Religious Pieces* (EETS), p. 79; *Hymns to V. and C.* (EETS), pp. 39, 58, 80, 83, 86; *An Old Eng. Misc.*, pp. 65, 69, 93, 156, 161, 170; *Chaucerian and Other Pieces* (ed. Skeat), pp. 291 ff., 449; *Herrigs Archiv*, Vol. CIX, p. 46; *Eng. Stud.*, Vol. XXI, p. 201; *The Poetical Works of Skelton* (ed. Dyce), Vol. I, p. 2; *The Gude and Godlie Ballatis*, p. 30; *The Poems of Dunbar* (Scot. T. S.), Vol. II, pp. 74 ff., 110, 226, 232, 244; *Rich. Rolle of Hampole*, Vol. I, pp. 73, 77, 367 ff.; *The Pricke of Conscience* (ed. Morris), pp. 39, 52.

[1] Act IV, sc. iv, ll. 91 ff.

[2] I, ll. 1 ff., and II, ll. 60 ff.

[3] *The Sayings of St. Bernard* (*Minor Poems of Vernon MS*, Vol. II), pp. 513, 692, and elsewhere in *The Sayings of St. Bernard;* Böddeker, *Alteng. Dicht.*, p. 195; *Eng. Stud.*, Vol. IX, p. 441; *Herrigs Archiv*, Vol. CIX, p. 42; *Pricke of Conscience*, pp. 40 ff.; *The Poems of Dunbar* (STS), Vol. II, p. 244. See Appendix, p. 29, for parallel passages.

[4] Ll. 120 ff.; see also *Chester*, Vol. II, p. 165.

[5] *Minor Poems of V. MS*, Vol. II, p. 692; *Wyt and Science and Early Poetical Miscellanies* (Shaks. Soc., Vol. II), pp. 110 ff.; *Anglia*, Vol. XXVI. pp. 192 ff.; *Rich. Rolle of Hampole*, Vol. II, p. 457; *Pricke of Cons.*, pp. 20 ff.

[6] Ll. 550, 551.

[7] *The Wanderer* (*Bibl. der angelsächs. Poesie*, Wülcker, II. 92 ff.); see also a somewhat similar form in *Body and Soul* poems.

the highly conventionalized and fixed form of Middle English. In the Towneley *Lazarus*[1] there is a lyrical passage which reminds one of the *Ubi Sunt* in theme, but differs from it very considerably in its type—a type which is about as common in Middle English as the better-known *Ubi Sunt.*[2] There is, moreover, a longer lyric in the *Lazarus* which is marked by the refrain "Amend thee man whilst thou may."[3] Poems of a very similar nature, most of them characterized by almost the same refrain, are abundant in the general body of lyric poetry of the day;[4] they too have their Latin prototype. Within this lyric another form makes its appearance—a form which the *verse* homilist is fond of using when preaching his sermons of the frightening sort. It reads here, "Thynk thou on the dredefull day," and, "Thynke thou farys as dothe the wynde."[5] Similar passages occur in many poems of the day.[6] In the *Lazarus* also the poet follows the body of man after death and describes it in detail.[7] The passage calls to mind scores of poems which treat the same theme, from some of which it very probably borrowed many a phrase and line. The most remarkable line which has worked its way into this passage is, "The Royfe of your hall,/your naked nose shall touche," which is present in almost all of the *Body and Soul* poems, and sometimes in the *Long Life* poems.[8]

[1] Ll. 111 ff.

[2] *Bann. MS*, Vol. I, p. 154; *Spec. of L. P.* (Percy Soc., Vol. IV), p. 87; *Religious Songs* (P. Soc., Vol. XI), p. 63; for Old French form see *Satirical Songs and Poems on Costume* (P. Soc., Vol. XXVII), p. 33; *Eng. Stud.*, Vol. XIV, p. 186; *Relig. Pieces* (EETS), p. 81; *An Old Eng. Misc.* (EETS), pp. 91, 94, 157; *Minor Poems of V. MS*, Vol. II, pp. 676, 678. Compare *Hymni Latini* (Mone), Vol. I, p. 398. For parallels see Appendix, p. 30.

[3] *Town.*, p. 392, ll. 174 ff.

[4] *Polit., Relig. and Love Poems*, pp. 215 ff.; *An Old Eng. Misc.*, pp. 62, 78; *Minor Poems of V. MS*, Vol. II, pp. 668, 672, 725 ff., 727 ff., 730 ff.; *Twenty-six Polit. and Other Poems*, pp. 60 ff.; *Anglia*, Vol. I, p. 411; Vol. II, p. 71; Vol. XXVI, p. 233; *Minor Poems of Lydgate* (Percy Soc., Vol. II), pp. 228 ff.; the poem is far too similar to other poems of this type to be called Lydgate's in any proper sense; *Religious Songs* (P. Soc., Vol. XI), pp. 63 ff.; *Songs and Carols* (P. Soc., Vol. XXIII), pp. 4, 29, 37, 45; *Bann. MS*, Vol. I, pp. 97, 103, 127, 129, 133, 138, 145, 201, 203; *Rich. Rolle of Hampole*, Vol. I, pp. 73, 76; *Herrigs Archiv*, Vol. CVI, pp. 275 ff. For Latin poems with somewhat similar refrain, see *Hymni Latini* (Mone), Vol. I, pp. 395 f.; *Cantiones* (Klemming), pp. 16 ff. See Appendix, pp. 32 ff., for parallel passages.

[5] Ll. 176, 178.

[6] *Spec. of Lyric Poetry* (Percy Soc., Vol. IV); *Religious Songs* (P. Soc., Vol. XI), p. 71; printed also in *An Old Eng. Misc.*, p. 170; *Minor Poems of the V. MS*, Vol. II, p. 477; *Rich. Rolle of Hamp.*, Vol. I, p. 156; *Pricke of Cons.*, p. 73; *Rel. Ant.*, Vol. I, p. 139. For Latin form, see *Latin Hymns* (March), p. 121. See Appendix, pp. 33 ff., for parallel passages.

[7] *Town.*, pp. 391 ff.

[8] Especially is it noticeable in the Anglo-Saxon specimen printed in *Anglia*, Vol. V., p. 289; *Eng. Stud.*, Vol. XIV, p. 184, ll. 153 ff. For other passages very similar to the *Lazarus*

The judgment-plays, among the very latest developments of the English cyclic plays, afford on the whole the most interesting examples of the influence of the independent poems upon the upbuilding of the cyclic dramas. It is impossible perhaps to arrive at a just estimate of their origin and development, without entering into a thoroughgoing investigation of the Doomsday literature of the Middle Ages; and that, of course, lies beyond the limits of this study. It seems possible, however, to get a notion of some sort as to their development in English. The York judgment-play seems to represent the most primitive form of the four plays in English. Its structure is fairly simple: an opening speech by God recounting the wickedness of mankind, brief praise of God by the angels, the cries of the good and bad souls as they awake, Christ's descent to earth, and brief talk with his angels, brief speeches of the devils, Christ's *Complaint or Testament*, his division of the good and bad souls, their questions and replies to Christ, Christ's blessing of the good souls and damning of the bad—this is about the plot of the play. One set of incidents in this play we find in the judgment-plays of Chester, Towneley, and Coventry, with varying degrees of elaboration: the cries of the good and bad souls as they awake and arise from their graves, Christ's reproaches to the bad and blessing to the good, the dialogue between Christ and the good and bad souls, the attempts of the bad souls to justify themselves, and the final blessing and damnation. And this set of incidents seems to constitute the general framework of the plays. Comparison of this portion of the plays with the treatment of the same theme in *The Pricke of Conscience*[1] makes it seem that even this portion was already more or less prepared for by the dialogue treatment of the same theme

description of what we come to after death, see *Rel. Ant.*, Vol. I, p. 139; *The Poet. Works of Skelton* (ed. Dyce), Vol. I, p. 19; *Anglia*, Vol. XXVII, p. 309; *Rich. Rolle of Hamp.*, Vol. I, pp. 73, 367 ff., 372; *Pricke of Con.*, pp. 13 ff.; *Wm. of Shoreham*, p. 32; *An Old Eng. Misc.*, pp. 78, 92, 172 ff., 178; *Minor P. of V. MS*, Vol. I, pp. 270, 335, 343; Vol. II, pp. 511 ff. Similar passages may be found in almost any of the *Body and Soul* poems. See for parallel passages, Appendix, p. 33.

[1] Ll. 6096 ff.; see further *Lamentacio Animarum*, in the same volume as *Be Domes Daege; Minor Poems of V. MS*, Vol. II, pp. 658 ff., 765 ff.; *An Old Eng. Misc.*, pp. 72 ff.; *Anglia*, Vol. III, p. 542. Compare the *Christ of Cynewulf* (ed. Cook), ll. 1470 ff.; here the treatment of the theme is in monologue. Compare also the Latin dialogue treatment of the same in *Hymni Latini* (Mone), Vol. I, pp. 416 ff. See for parallel passages, Appendix, pp. 35 ff.

in verse. Chester has departed far from the simple scheme of York, the most noticeable difference being that the saved and the damned souls become particular persons representing various classes and kinds of people, each person having put into his mouth a repentant speech revealing the particular vices of his class of society. For this development the play is largely indebted to the various satires on the classes of the times, and perhaps to *The Dance of Death* literature.[1] Coventry has departed from the simple York scheme mainly in the matter of the devils at the end of the play[2] becoming the accusers of the bad souls, recounting their sins and tormenting them. This may be due to the influence of the Towneley *Judgment*, in which this becomes the chief incident of the play, Tutivillus there becoming the dominant figure and taking the center of the stage most of the time. An old fragment of a poem in *Reliquiae Antiquae*[3] shows that this conception of Tutivillus was current in the literature of the day.

It is in the Towneley *Judgment*, however, that we have the farthest departure from the simple structure of York,[4] and it is in this play that we have the best example of how the plays sometimes drew largely on the other forms of literature of the day. Excepting ll. 434–531, which seem to be the germ-portion of the play,[5] almost the entire play is made up of portions of verse gathered from various sources, echoing various independent forms and types, and withal blended together in a remarkably effective and dramatic fashion. The writer of this play and presumably of the Towneley *Noah*, *Herod the Great*, and the *Shepherd's Play*, *I* and *II*, was familiar with a very considerable portion of the great body of homiletic and satirical poetry of his times, and it is mainly due to his adaptation of it to his dramatic needs that the Corpus Christi play in England is brought to its highest literary development.

The opening lines of the play[6] may be compared with passages in *The Pricke of Conscience* dealing with the same scene.[7]

[1] See Chambers, *The Med. Stage*, Vol. II, p. 153 (notes); Creizenach, Vol. I, p. 461.

[2] The play is incomplete at the end. [3] Vol. I, p. 257.

[4] See the York *Judgment Day* text for parallel passages in *York* and *Town.*

[5] See above, p. 12. [6] *Town.*, pp. 367 ff.; see also *York*, pp. 500 ff.; *Cov.*, p. 402.

[7] Pp. 135 ff., 190 ff., 199; see also *Rich. Rolle of Hamp.*, Vol. II, p. 446.

Lines 143–51, 179–87, 282–86, 296–304, 332–67, 576–88 are alliterative lists of sinners who are to be found in hell, which have been current in Middle English homiletic verse from the *Moral Ode*[1] poems on. Lines 394 ff. are exceedingly similar to the lines in other poems which describe judgment day,[2] probably a rendering of the great "Dies irae," most familiar to us in modern times in Sir Walter Scott and Mozart. This passage is followed immediately by *Christ's Testament*.[3] Almost all of the remaining portions of the Towneley *Judgment* are adaptations of satires on various subjects, mainly on women.[4] While taken collectively, the English judgment-plays seem to be the adaptation of the Doomsday dialogue between Christ and the good and bad souls to dramatic purposes, Towneley is very largely homiletic in its tone, and but for the previous development of the Middle English sermons in prose and verse could never have taken on its present form.

This is scarcely the place to call attention to the relation of the drama to other forms of Middle English poetry whose character is not in some sense lyrical. It is going somewhat out of the way to notice, for example, the similarity between the grotesque meal of the shepherds in the Towneley *Shepherd's Play No. I*[5] and the *Grotesque Receipts*,[6] between the speech of Death in *The Slaughter of the Innocents*[7] and *The Dance of Death* of Lydgate,

[1] *Anglia*, Vol. I, pp. 6 ff. (for other editions, see *A Middle English Reader*, ed. O. F. Emerson, p. 297). For other passages of the kind, see *York*, p. 340; *Cov.*, p. 404; *An Old Eng. Misc.*, pp. 64, 67, 76, 150 ff., 187, 212, 225; *Minor Poems of V. MS* (EETS), Vol. I, pp. 253 ff.; *Altenglische Sprachproben*, pp. 330 ff.; *The Poems of Dunbar* (Scot. T. Soc.), pp. 79, 81, 221; *The Poetical Works of Skelton* (Dyce), Vol. I, pp. 98, 149, 369; *Religious Songs* (Percy Soc., Vol. XI) pp. 80 ff.; *Eng. Stud.*, Vol. I, p. 99; *Pricke of Cons.*, pp. 92, 164 ff.; *Rich. Rolle of Hamp.*, Vol. I, p. 153; *Chaucerian and Other Poems* (Skeat), p. 172; *Herrigs Archiv*, Vol. LXXXVI, pp. 387 ff. See also *Piers Plowman* (ed. Skeat) for many passages of the kind. See Appendix, p. 31, for parallel passages.

[2] See *The Pricke of Cons.*, pp. 71, 165; *Rich. Rolle of Hamp.*, Vol. I, p. 129; *Twenty-six Polit. and Other Poems*, pp. 118, 142. For the Latin form see *Hymni Latini* (Mone), Vol. I, pp. 402, 415; see further *Latin Hymns* (March), pp. 154 ff., 292 f. See Appendix for parallels.

[3] See above, p. 12.

[4] I hope to publish very shortly a paper on the subject of the influence of the satire of the day upon the Corpus Christi plays.

[5] See also, *Chester*, Vol. I, pp. 119 ff.

[6] *Anglia*. Vol. XVIII, p. 295; Vol. XXVI, p. 270; *Rel. Ant.*, Vol. I, pp. 51, 56, 81, 239, 250, 325; *Bann. MS*, Vol. II, pp. 388, 402 ff.; *Songs and Carols* (Percy Soc., Vol. XXIII), p. 23. See Appendix, p. 34, for parallel passages.

[7] *The Coventry Mysteries*, pp. 84 ff.; cf. *Chester*, Vol. I, p. 186.

between the *Geography in Verse*[1] and the Hegge play of *The Temptation;*[2] between *The Fifteen Signs of Judgment* in the Chester play *Ezechiel* and the treatment of the same theme in non-dramatic verse;[3] and, finally, between the various *Creeds*, *Pater Nosters*, *Ten Commandments*,[4] and other themes of a somewhat similar nature, treated in the general poetry of the time and the drama as well.

Leaving out of consideration these last-mentioned forms, it is apparent even from the hasty consideration of the lyrical forms given above, and it will be still more apparent after the more careful consideration of that large body of non-dramatic and dramatic *Planctus Mariae*, and the still larger body of lyrical dialogue covering almost as completely as the lyrical plays themselves the field of biblical narrative, to what extent the plays are indebted to the antecedent and contemporaneous religious lyric of Middle English. It is hardly going too far when we say that about one-fourth of the great body of material found in the York and Towneley cycles is, in the broad sense of the word, lyrical. Chester and Hegge, though not indebted to the lyric so largely as are York and Towneley, are, when we consider them in their entirety, very considerably indebted. Sometimes, as has been suggested, the dramatic lyric contains merely an echo of the lyric proper; sometimes it follows it in thought and phrase more or less closely; sometimes it has been inserted bodily from without, retaining the phrase and rhyme of the original; and very occasionally the lyric may even have formed perhaps the starting-point of certain of the plays. Of course, it is open to anyone to believe that the original lyric portions of the liturgical drama came by a gradual process of development to their present form in the Corpus Christi plays. But it seems highly probable that in the great majority of cases, as the drama widened its scope, it drew again

[1] *Rel. Ant.*, Vol. I, p. 271; see also *The Play of the Sacrament*, ll. 15 ff.; Manly, *Pre-Shaks. Drama*, Vol. I, p. 243.

[2] Pp. 210 ff.

[3] See *Be Domes Daege and other Pieces* (EETS), pp. 91 ff.; *Anglia*, Vol. III, pp. 534 ff.; Vol. XI, pp. 369 ff.; Mätzner's *Alteng. Sprachproben*, pp. 121 ff.; *Jahrbuch für romanische und englische Philologie*, Vol. V, pp. 194 ff.; Paul and Braune, Vol. XI, pp. 413 ff.; R. Peiper, "Zur Gesch. der mittellat. Dichtung," in *Arch. f. Literaturgesch.*, Vol. IX, pp. 117 ff.

[4] See Appendix, p. 28, for parallel passages.

and again upon the vast field of the lyric, which was developing side by side with it, using the same themes as the drama, and treating these themes in a way not essentially different.

Whatever may be the specific relation of the particular lyrics to particular plays, it is fairly clear that we have here another example of the method of development of the drama as stated by Professor Manly in his explanation of the relation of the moralities to the Corpus Christi plays. "The moralities," he says, "are not to be regarded as growing out of the Corpus Christi plays, but are merely an instance of the theory that the dramatic instinct, once set going, tended to dramatize material already at hand in other provinces of literature."[1] So it is in regard to the lyrics. The drama has done with them what it has been doing ever since it took its rise in the liturgy. It has simply extended its province in such fashion as to include other contemporaneous forms of literature already existing side by side with it.

APPENDIX

DRAMA	LYRIC
Chester Plays, Vol. II, p. 127	Wackernagel, *Das deutsche Kirchenlied*, Vol. II, p. 75
Jacobus Major.	
Come, Holye Ghoste, come creator,	Veni, creator spiritus,
Viscitte our thoughtes in this stowre;	mentes tuorum visita,
Thou arte mans conqueroure;	Imple superna gratia,
And graunte us, Lorde, thy grace.	quae tu creasti, pectora.
Johannes.	
Thou that arte called counscelor,	Qui paraclitus diceris
And sende from heaven as Savyour,	donum dei altissimi,
Well of life, leache of langor,	Fons vivus, ignis, charitas
That prayen heare in this place.	et spiritalis unctio.
Thomas.	
Yea, that in seven monthes woulde conseayle	Tu septifomis munere,
Grace of thy ghoste aboute to deale,	dextrae tu digitus,
As thou promised for mans heale,	Tu rite promissum patris
Appeare nowe, since I praye.	sermone ditans guttura.

[1] For the larger application and fuller development of this theory see Manly, "Literary Forms and the New Theory of the Origin of Species," *Modern Philology*, Vol. IV, pp. 577 ff.

DRAMA	LYRIC
Jacobus Minor.	
Lighte our wittes with thy wayle;	Accende lumen sensibus,
Put life in our thoughtes lele;	insunde amorem cordibus,
Lixom thy frendes that bene frayle,	Infirma nostri corporis
With vertues lastinge (aye).	virtute firmans perpeti.
Phillipus.	
Vanishe our enemyes farre awaie,	Hostem repellas longius
And graunte us peace, Lorde, to our paie;	pacemque dones protinus,
For while thou arte our leader aye,	Ductore sic te praevio
We maye ashewe anye.	vitemus omne noxium.
Bartholomes.	
Through thy mighte knowe we may,	Da gaudiorum praemia,
The father of heaven full in good faye,	da gratiarum munera,
And ye, his sonne, in south to saye,	Dissolve litis vincula,
Thou arte in companye.	astringe pacis foedera.
Mathieus.	
Worshipped be thou ever and oo,	Per te sciamus, da, patrem,
The father and the sonne also;	noscamus atque filium,
Let thy ghoste nowe from thee goe.	Et utriusque spiritum
And faith that we maie fynde.	credamus omni tempore.

Towneley Plays, pp. 316, 327, 328

Maria Iacobi. Alas! how stand I on my feete
when I thynk on his woundys wete!
Ihesus, that was on luf so swete,
And neuer dyd yll.
Is dede and grafen under the grete,
withoutten skyll.

Lucas. *When I thynk* on his passyon,
And on his moder how she can swoyn,
To dy nere am I bowne,
ffor sorow I sagh hir make;
Vnder the crosse when she fell downe,
ffor hir son sake.

Horstmann's *Richard Rolle of Hampole*, Vol. I, p. 78

Of Ihesu mast lyst me speke,
that al my bale may bete.
Me thynk my hert may al to-breke,
when I thynk on that swete.
In lufe lacyd he hase my thoght,
that I sal neuer forgete:
Ful dere me thynk he hase me boght,
with blodi hende & fete.

Specimens of Lyric Poetry (Percy Society), Vol. IV, p. 83

When y thenke on Jesu blod,
that ran doun bi ys syde,
From his herte doun to his fot,
For ous he spradde his herte blod.
his wondes were so wyde.

DRAMA	LYRIC
Towneley Plays, pp. 114 f.	*Minor Poems of the Vernon MS*, Vol. I, p. 24
Lucas. where so I fare he is my mynde, *Bot when I thynk* on hym so kynde, how sore gyltles that he was pyynde Apon a tre, Vnethes may I hold my mynde, So sore myslykys me.	*When y thenke* on Jhesu ded, min herte over-werpes, Mi soule is won so is the led for my fole werkes. Ful wo is that ilke mon, That Jhesu ded ne thenkes on, what he soffrede so sore! For my synnes y wil wete, Ant alle y wyle hem for-lete nou ant evermore.
primus pastor. hayll, kyng I the call!/ hayll, most of myght! hayll, the worthyst of all!/*hayll, duke!* *hayll, knyght!* Of greatt and small/thou art lorde by right; hayll, perpetuall!/hayll, faryst wyght! here I offer! I pray the to take— If thou wold, for my sake, with this may thou lake,— This lytyll spruse cofer.	*Heil kyng, heil kniht,* heil mon of most miht, Prince in thi Trone, *Heil Duyk*, heil Emperour, Heil beo thou gouernour Of al this worldus wone. Heil flesch, heil blod, heil mon of mylde mod, Heil beo thow kyng; Heil God ffeirest, Heil beo thou, bern best, Thow madest alle thyng.
York Mystery Plays, p. 443.	*Christmas Carols*, p. 4 (Percy Society, Vol. IV).
Welcome! oure wytt and our wysdome, Welcome! our joy all and somme, Welcome! redemptour omnium tyll hus hartely.	Wolcum yol, thu mery man, in worchepe of this holy day.
Anna. Welcome! blyssed Mary and madyn ay, Welcome! mooste meke in thyne array, Welcome! bright starne that shyneth bright as day, all for our blys.	Wolcum be thu, hevene kyng, Wolcum, born in on morwenyng, Wolcum, for hom we xal syng, wolcum, yol.
Welcome! the blyssed beam so bryght, Welcome! the leym of all oure light,	Wolcum be ye, Stefne and Jon, Wolcum, Innocentes everychon,

DRAMA

Welcome! that all pleasour hais plight
to man and wyfe.

Welcome! thowe blyssed babb so free,
Welcome! oure welfayre wyelly,
And welcome all our seall, suthly,
to grete and small.

Babb, welcome to thy beydly boure,
Babb, welcome nowe for our soccoure,
And babb, welcome with all honour
here in this hall.

York Mystery Plays, p. 487

Thom.

Farewele, thou schynyng schappe
that schyniste so schire,
Farewele, the belle of all bewtes to
bide here;
Farwele thou faire foode,
Farewele the keye of counsaile,
Farewele all this worldes wele,
Farewele, our hap and oure hele,
Farewele nowe, both gracious and
goode.

LYRIC

Wolcum, Thomas marter on,
wolcom, yol.

Wolcum be ye, good newe yere,
Wolcum, twelthe day bothe in fere,
Wolcum, seyntes lef and dere,
wolcum, yol.

Wolcum be ye, Candylmesse,
Wolcum be ye, qwyn of blys,
Wolcum bothe to more and lesse,
wolcum, yol.

Wolcum be ye that arn here,
Wolcum, alle, and mak good chere,
Wolcum, alle, another yere
wolcum, yol.

The Bannatyne MS., p. 255

Welcum, illustrat layde and oure
quene!
Welcum, oure lyone with the floure
delyce!
Welcum, oure thriffill with the Lorane
grene!
Welcum, oure rubent rois vpon the
ryce!
Welcum, oure jem and joyfull gene-
tryce!
Welcum, oure beill of Albion to beir!
Welcum, oure pleasand princes maist
of pryce!
God gif the grace agains this guid
new yeir.

Early English Ballads,
"Songs and Carols," p. 57

Farwell, Crystmas fayer and fre;
Farwell, newers day with the;
Farwell the holy Epyphane;
And to Mary now syng we,
Revertere, revertere,
the quene of blysse and of beaute.

DRAMA

The Towneley Plays, p. 203

ffarwell! the frelyst that euer was fed!
ffarwell! floure more fresh than floure de lyce!
ffarwell! stersman to theym that ar sted
In stormes, or in desese lyse!
Thi moder was madyn and wed;
ffarwell! pereles, most of pryce!
ffarwell! the luflyst that euer was bred!
Thi moder is of hell emprise.

ffarwell! blissid both bloode and bone!
ffarwell! the semelyst that euer was seyn!
To the, ihesu, I make my mone;
ffarwell! comly, of cors so cleyn!
ffarwel! gracyouse gome! where so thou gone;
fful mekill grace is to the geyn;
Thou leyne vs lyffyng on thi lone,
Thou may vs mende more then we weyn.

York Mystery Plays, p. 484 f.

Thom.
To bide with thy barne in blisse to be bidand!
Hayle! jentilest of Jesse in Jewes generacion,
Haile! welthe of this worlde all welthis is weldand,
Haile! hendest enhaunsed to high habitacion.
Haile! derworth and dere is the diewe dominacion.
Haile! floure fresshe florisshed, thi frewte is full felesome.
Haile! sete of oure saveour and sege of saluacion,
Haile! happy to helde to, thi helpe is full helesome.

LYRIC

The Bannatyne MS., Vol. II, p. 645

Fair weill, my hairt, fair weill bayth friend and fo,
Fair weill, the weill of sweitast medicyne,
Fair weill, my lufe, bayth lyfe and deth also;
Fair weill, blythnes, fairweill, sweit lemmane myne,
Fair weill, the flour of colour gud and fyne,
That fadis nocht for weddir wen nor weit,
No moir than in the somer sessone sweit.

Anglia, Vol. XXVI, p. 166

Hayle be thou godly graunter of grace,
Hayle blessyd stere on the see,
hayle be thow, cumforte in euery case,
Hayle be thow, cheffe of chastyte,
Hayle well, hayle wytt of all mercye,
Hayle be thou highest in hevyns blome,
Hayle, Jentyll lady, I pray the
ffunde preces ad filium!
Hayle be thou, virgyn of virgyns,
hayle blessed lady & hayle swete may,
Hayle be thou moder of dere Ihesus,
Hayle cheff of chastite, so well thow may,

DRAMA

Haile! pereles in plesaunce,
Haile! precious and pure,
Haile! salue that is sure,
Haile! lettir of langure
Haile! bote of oure bale in obeyesaunce.

York Mystery Plays, p. 445

Come myghtyest by see and by sandes,
Come myrth by strete and by strandes
on moolde.

Come halse me, the babb that is best born,
Come halse me, the myrth of our morne,
Come halse me, for elles I ame lorne for olde,

York Mystery Plays, p. 484

x Ang. Come chosen childe!
xi Ang. Come Marie milde!
xii Ang. Come floure vnfiled!
viii Ang. Come vppe to the kyng to be crouned.

LYRIC

hayle blessid lady to thy son thow say,
that we may cum to his kyngdome,
for me and all crystyn thow pray,
pro salute fidelium!
Explicit.

Wackernagel, *Das deutche Kirchenlied*, p. 246 ff.

Veni, praecelfa domina,
Maria, tu nos visita,
Aegras mentes illumina
per sacrae numina.

Veni, falvatrix faeculi,
sordes auser piaculi,
In visitando populum
poenae tollas periculum.

Veni, regina gentium,
dele flammas reatuum,
Rege quodcunque devium,
da vitam innocentium.

Veni ut aegros visites,
Maria, vires robores
Virtute sacri impetus,
ne fluctuetur animus.

Veni stella, lux marium,
insunde pacis radium,
Exultet cor in gaudium
Iohannis ante dominum,

Veni, virga regalium,
reduc fluctus errantium
Ad unitatem fidei,
in qua flavantur caelici.

Veni, deposce spiritus
sancti dona propensius,
Ut dirigamur rectius
in huius vitae actibus.

Veni, laudemus filium,
laudemus sanctum spiritum,
Laudemus patrem unicum,
qui nobis dat auxilium.

DRAMA

York Mystery Plays, pp. 494 ff.

i Ang. Nowe maiden meke and modir myne,
Itt was full mekill myrthe to the,
That I schulde ligge in wombe of thine,
Thurgh gretyng of an aungell free.

ii Ang. The secounde joie modir was syne,
With-outen payne whan thou bare me.

iii Angelus. The thirde aftir my bittir peyne,
Fro dede on lyve thou sawe me be.

iv Ang. The fourthe was when I stied vppe right,
To heuene vnto my fadir dere,
My modir, when thou saugh that sight,
To the it was a solas seere.

v Ang. This is the fifte, thou worthy wight,
Of the jois this has no pere,
Nowe schall thou belde in blisse so bright,
For euer and ay, I highte the here.

Towneley Plays, pp. 182 ff.

ffor I am old symeon:
So old on lyfe know I none,
That is mayde on flesh and bone,
In all medyll-erd.
No wonder if I go on held:
The feuyrs, the flyx, make me vnweld;
Myn armes, my lymmes, are stark for eld,
And all gray is my berd.

LYRIC

Anglia, Vol. XXVI, p. 242 ff.

Mary for the loue of the,
blyth & glad may we be,
& I shall syng as ye may se:
sua quinque gaudia.

The fyrst Joy was sent to the,
Whan gabryell gretyd the,
& sayd: hayle mary in chastite
efficiaris gravida!

The second Joy was full god,
Whan cryst toke both flesshe & blod,
withowte syn talkyng of mode
enixa es puerpera.

The iijde Joy was of gret myght,
Whan Jhesu was on the rode dyght,
Dede & buryed in all menys syght,
surrexit die tercia.

The iiijth Joy was withowt(e n) a y
Whan Jhesu to hell toke the way,
& with hym com gret a ray,
ad celi palacia.

The Vth Joy was on holy thursday.
vnto hevyn he toke the way,
god & man, & so he ys for ay.
ascendit super sidera.

Reliquiae Antiquae, Vol. II, p. 211

Al thus eld me for-dede,
Thus he toggith ute mi ted,
and drawith ham on rewe;
y ne mai no more of love done,
Mi pilkoc pisseth on mi schone,
uch schenlon me bischrewe.
Mine hed is hore and al for-fare,
I-hewid as a grei mare,
mi bodi wexit lewe.
When I bihold on mi schennen,

DRAMA

Myn ees are woren both marke and blynd;
Myn and is short, I want wynd;
Thus has age dystroed my kynd,
And reft myghtis all;
Bot shortly mon I weynd away;
what tyme ne when, I can not say,
ffor it is gone full many a day
Syn dede began to call.

Ther is no wark that I may wyrk,
Bot oneths crall I to the kyrk;
Be I com home I am so irk
That farther may I noght;
Bot settys me downe, and grankys, and gronys,
And lygys and restys my wery bonys,
And all nyght after grankys and goonys,
On slepe tyll I be broght.

Manly, Specimens of Pre-Shakesperean Drama, Vol. I, p. 152

Doune from heaven, from heaven so hie,
Of angeles ther came a great companie,
With mirthe and joy and great solemnitye,
The(y) sange terly terlow,
So mereli the sheppards ther pipes can blow.

Chester Plays, pp. 140 f.

Heale, kinge! borne in a maydens bower,
Proffittes did tell Thou shouldest be our succore,
Thus clarkes doth saye.

LYRIC

Min dimmith al for-dwynnen,
mi frendis waxith fewe.

Now I pirtle, I poste, I poute,
I snurpe, I snobbe, I sneipe on snoute,
throȝ kund I comble and kelde;
I lench, I len, on lyme I lasse,
I poke, I pomple, I palle, I passe,
as gallith gome I geld;

I rivele, I roxle, I rake, I rouwe,
I clyng, I cluche, I croke, I couwe,
thus he wol me aweld.
I grunt, I grone, I grenne, I gruche,
I nase, I neppe, I nifle, I nuche,
and al this wilneth eld.

I stunt, I stomere, I stomble as sledde,
I blind, I bleri, I bert in bedde,
such sond is me sent;
I spitte, I spatle in spech, I sporne,
I werne, I lutle, ther-for I murne,
thus is mi wel i-went.

Anglia, Vol. XXVI, pp. 237 ff.

Tyrly tirlow, tirly tirlow
so merily the shepardes be gan to blow!
A bowt the felde they pypyd ryght,
So meryly the shepardes be gan to blow,
A down from hevyn yat ys so hygh:
terly terlow!

Angellys ther cam A cumpany,
with mery songes And melody,
The shepardes Anon that gan A spye
terly terlow!

Anglia, Vol. XXVI, pp. 243 ff.

Can I not syng but Hoy!
Whan the Ioly shepard made so mych Ioy!
(1) The shepard vpon a hill he satt,
he had on hym his tabard & his hat,

DRAMA

Loe, I bringe thee a bell:
I praie thee save me from hell,
So that I maye with thee dwell,
And serve thee for aye.

Secundus Pastor

Heale the, emperower of hell,
And of heaven allsoe![1]
The feynde shall thee fell,
That ever hath bene false.
Heale the, maker of the starre,
That stode us beforne;
Heale the, blessed full barne,
Loe, sonne, *I bringe thee a flaggette,*
Theirby heinges a sponne,
To eate thy pottage with all at nonne,
As I myselfe full ofte tymes have done,
With harte I praie thee to take.

Tercius Pastor

Heale, prince without anye peare,
That mankinde shall releeve!
Heale thee, froo unto Luciffier,
The which begyled Eve!
Heale the, granter of happe,
For in yeairth nowe thou dwelleste.
Loe, sonne, I bringe thee a cape,
For I have nothinge elles:
This gueifte, sonne, I bringe thee is but small,
And though I come the hyndmoste of all,
When thou shall them to thy blesse call,
Good Lorde, yet thinke on me.

Trowle.

My dere, with dutye unto thee I me dresse,
My state and felloshippe that I doe not lose,
For to save me from all yle sicknes,
I offer unto thee a payer of my wifes oulde hose,
For other dremes, my sonne,

[1] Read *alse.*

LYRIC

hys tarbox, hys pype, and *hys flagat,*
hys name was called Ioly, Ioly Wat!
for he was a gud herdes boy, vt hoy!
for in hys pype he made so mych joy,
Can I not sing but hoy!
(2) The shepard upon a hill was layd,
Hys doge to hys gyrdyll was tayd,
He had not slept but a lytill brayd
but gloria in excelcis was a hym sayd vt hoy!
for in his pipe he made so mych joy!
Can I not syng &c.
(3) The shepard on A hill He stode
Rownd a bowt hym his shepe they yode,
he put hys hond vnder hys hode,
he saw a star as rede as blod.
Vt hoy!
for in hys pipe he made so myche joy,
Can I not syng &c.
(4) Now farwell mall & also will,
for my love go ye all styll,
vnto I cum a gayn you till,
And euermore(W)ill ryng well thy bell, vt hoy!
for in his pipe he mad so mych Joy!
Can I not sing &c.
(5) *Now must I go yer cryst was borne*
farewell I cum a gayn to morn
Dog kepe well my shep fro ye corn!
& warn well warroke when I blow my horn!
Vt hoy!
for in his pipe he mad so mych joy!
Can I not syng &c.
(6) Whan wat to bedlem cum was,
he swet, he had gone faster than a pace,
He fownd Ihesu in a sympyll place,
be twen An ox & an asse,
vt hoy!
for in his pipe he mad so mych joy!
Can I not syng but hoy &c.
(7) The shepard sayd A non ryght:
I will go se yon farly syght,
Wher as ye Angell syngith on hight,

DRAMA

Have I non for to geve,
That is worth anye thinge at all,
But my good harte, while I live,
And my prayers tell death doe me call.

The Firste Boye.

Nowe, Lorde, for to geve thee have I nothinge,
Nether goulde, silver, bruche, ner ringe,
Nor no riche robes mete for a kinge,
That I have heare in store:
But that yt lackes a stoppell,
Take thee heare my well fayer bottill,
for it will houlde a good pottill,
In faith, I can geve thee no more.

The Secounde Boye.

Lorde, thou arte of this virgine borne,
In full poore araye sittinge on her arme,
For to offer to thee I have no skorne,
Allthough thou be but a childe;
For jewell have I non to geve thee,
For to mantayne thy royall dignitie
But my hude, then take it thee,
As thou arte god and man.

The Thirde Boye.

O, noble childe of thee!
Alas! what have I for thee,
Save onlye my pipe?
Elles trewlye nothinge,
Were I in the rockes or in,
I coulde make this pippe,
That all this woode shoulde ringe,
And quiver, as yt were.

The Fourth Boye.

Nowe, childe, although thou be comon from God,
And be God thy selfe in thy manhoode,
Thou wylte for sweete meate loke,
Yet I knowe that in thy childehoode
To pull downe aples, peares, and plumes,

[1] *at?*

LYRIC

& the star yet shynyth so bryght!
vt hoy!
for in his pipe he made so mych Ioy,
Can I not syng but Hoy!
(8) *Ihesu I offer to the here my pype,*
My (skyrte), my tarbox & my (scrype),
Home to my felowes now will I skype,
& also loke unto my shepe!
vt hoy!
ffor in his pipe he made so mych Ioy,
can I not syng but Hoy!
(9) *Now farewell, myne owne herdes man wat!*
ye for god, lady even so I hat!
Lull well Ihesu in thy lape,
& farewell Ioseph wyth thy rownd cape!
vt hoy!
for in hys pype he mad so myche Ioy,
can I not syng &c.
(10) Now may I well both hope & syng,
ffor I haue bene *a*[1] crystes beryng,
home to my felowes now wyll I flyng,
Cryst of hevyn to his blis vs bryng!
vt hoy,
for in his pipe he mad so myche joy,
can I not syng &c.

DRAMA

Oulde Joseph shall not nede to hurte
his thombes,
Because thou hast not pleintie of
crombes,
I geve thee heare my nutthocke.

Primus Pastor.

Nowe, fare well, mother and maye,
For of synne naughte thou *wotteste,*[1]
Thou haste brought fourth this daie
Godes sonne of mighteste moste.
Wherefore men shall saye,
Blessed in everye coste and place
Be thou memoriall for me and for us
all.
And that we maie from syne fall,
And stande ever in thy grace,
Our Lorde God be with thee.

LYRIC

Towneley XXVI, *The Resurrection of the Lord*, ll. 314 f.

Behald my shankes and my knees,
Myn armes and my thees;
Behold we well, looke what thou sees,
Bot sorow and pyne;
Thus was I spylt, for thi gylt,
And not for myne.

And yit more vnderstand thou shall;
In stede of drynk thay gaf me gall,
Asell thay menged it withall,
The Iues fell;
The payn I haue, tholyd I to saue
Mans saull from hell.

Behold my body how Iues it dang
with knottys of whyppys and scorges
strang;
As stremes of well the bloode out
sprang
On euery syde;
knottes where thay hyt, well may
thou wytt,
Maide woundys wyde.

The Poetical Works of Skelton (Dyce), pp. 144 f.

Beholde my shankes, behold my knees,
Beholde my hed, armes, and thees,
Beholde of me nothyng thou sees
But sorowe and pyne;
Thus was I spylt,
Man, for thy gylte,
And not for myne.

Behold my body, how Jewes it donge
With knots of whipcord and scourges
strong;
As stremes of a well the blode out
sprong
On euery syde;
The knottes were knyt,
Ryght well made with wyt,
They made woundes wyde.

Man, thou shalt now vnderstand,
Of my head, both fote and hand,
Are four c. and fyue thousand
woundes and sixty;
Fifty and vii
Were tolde full euen
Vpon my body.

[1] Read *wast.*

DRAMA

And therfor thou shall vnderstand
In body, heed, feete, and hand,
ffour hundreth woundys and fyue thowsand
here may thou se;
And therto neyn were delt full euen
ffor luf of the.

Behold on me noght els is lefte,
And or that thou were fro me refte,
All thise paynes wold I thole efte
And for the dy;
here may thou se that I luf the,
Man, faythfully.

Sen I for luf, man, boght the dere,
As thou thi self the sothe sees here,
I pray the hartely, with good chere,
luf me agane;
That it lyked me that I for the
tholyd all this payn.

If thou thy lyfe in syn haue led,
Mercy to ask be not adred;
The leste drope I for the bled
Myght clens the soyn,
All the syn the warld with in
If thou had done.

I was well wrother with Iudas
ffor that he wold not ask me no grace,
Then I was for his trespas
That he me sold;
I was redy to shew mercy,
Aske none he wold.
lo how I hold myn armes on brede,
The to saue ay redy mayde;
That I great luf ay to the had,
well may thou knaw!
Som luf agane I wold full fayn
Thou wold me shaw.

Bot luf noght els aske I of the,
And that thou fownde fast syn to fle;
pyne the to lyf in charyte
Both nyght and day;
Then in my blys that neuer shall mys
Thou shall dwell ay.

LYRIC

Syth I for loue bought thé so dere,
As thou may se thy self here,
I pray thé with a ryght good chere
Loue me agayne,
That it lykes me
To suffre for thé
Now all this payne.

Man, vnderstand now thou shall.
In sted of drynke they gaue me gall,
And eysell mengled therwithall,
The Jewes fell;
These paynes on me
I suffred for thé
To bryng thé fro hell.

Now for thy lyfe thou hast mysled,
Mercy to aske be thou not adred;
The lest drop of blode that I for thé bled
Myght clense thé soone
Of all the syn
The worlde within,
If thou haddest doone.

I was more wrother with Judas,
For he wold no mercy aske,
Than I was for his trespas
Whan he me solde;
I was euer redy
To graunt hym mercy,
But he none wolde.

Lo, how I hold my armes abrode,
Thé to receyue redy isprode!
For the great loue that I to thé had
Well may thou knowe,
Some loue agayne
I wolde full fayne
Thou woldest to me shewe.

For loue I ask nothyng of thé
But stand fast in faythe, and syn thou fle,
And payne to lyue in honeste
Both nyght and day;
And thou shalt have blys
That neuer shall mys
Withouten nay.

DRAMA

Towneley, XVIII, ll. 143 ff. *The Play of the Doctors*

"The thyrd bydys," where so ye go,
That ye shal halow the holy day;
ffrom bodely wark ye take youre rest;
youre household, looke the same thay do,
Both wyfe, chyld, seruande, and beest.
The fourt is then in weyll and wo
"Thi fader, thi moder, thou shall honowre,
Not only with thi reuerence,
Bot in thare nede thou thaym socoure,
And kepe ay good obedyence."

The fyft bydys the "no man slo,
ne harme hym neuer in word ne dede,
Ne suffre hym not to be in wo
If thou may help hym in his nede."

The sext bydys the "thi wyfe to take,
Bot none othere lawfully;
lust of lechery thou fle and fast forsake,
And drede ay god where so thou be."

The seuen bydys the "be no thefe feyr,
Ne nothyng wyn with trechery;
Oker, ne symony, thou com not nere,
Bot conscyence clere ay kepe truly."

The aght byddys the "be true in dede,
And fals wytnes looke thou none bere;
looke thou not ly for freynd ne syb,
lest to thi saull that it do dere."

The neyn byddys the "not desyre
Thi neghburs wyfe ne his women,
Bot as holy kyrk wold it were,
Right so thi purpose sett it in."

The ten byddys the "for nothyng
Thi neghburs goodys yerne wrongwysly;
his house, his rent, ne his hafyng,
And crysten fayth trow stedfastly."

LYRIC

Reliquiae Antiquae, Vol. I, p. 49

Tertium Mandatum

Thy haliday kepe wele alsso,
Fra bodely werk thow take thy rest;
And all thy howshald the same sall do,
Bothe wyf and childe, servant and beste.

Quartum Mandatum

Thy fadir and modir thow shalt honour,
Noght onely with reverence,
Bot in thaire nede thou thaym socour,
And keep ay gode obedience.

Quintum Mandatum

Of mankynde thou shalt none sle,
Ne harm with worde, wyll, nor dede;
Ne suffir non lorn ne lost to be
If thow wele may than help at nede.

Sextum Mandatum

Thy wyf thou may in tyme wele take,
Bot non other womman lawfulle;
Lechory and synful lust thou fle and forsake,
And drede ay God where so thou be.

Septimum Mandatum

Be thou no thef, nor theves fere,
Ne nothing wyn with trechery;
Okur ne symony cum thow not nere,
Bot conciens clere kepe ay trewely.

Octavum Mandatum

Thow shalt in worde be trewe alsso;
And fals wytnes thou shalt none bere;
Loke thow not lye for frende nor foo,
Lest thow thy saull full grately dere.

Nonum Mandatum

Thy neghbur wyf thou not desire,
Nor othir wymmen with syn covet,
Bot as haly kirk wald it were,
Right so thy purpos loke thou set.

Decimum Mandatum

Hows, ne land, ne othir thyng,
Thow shalt not covet wrangfully;
Bot kepe ay wele Goddes biddying,
And cristen fayth trow stedfastly.

DRAMA

Towneley Plays, p. 100, ll. 4–13

Now in hart, now in heyll/now in weytt, now in blast,
Now in care,
Now in comforth agane,
Now is fayre, now is rane,
Now in hart full fane,
And after full sare.

Thus this Warld, as I say/farys on ylk syde,
ffor after oure play/com sorows vnryde;
ffor he that most may/When he syttys in pryde,
When it comys on assay/is kesten downe wyde.

Coventry Mysteries, p. 88

Angelus:

In your name Maria ffyve letterys we han,—
M. Mayde most mercyfulle and mekest in mende;
A. Averte of the anguysche that Adam began;
R. Regina of regyon reyneng withowtyn ende;
I. Innocent be influens of Jesses kende;
A. Advocat most autentyk your autecer Anna,
Hefne and helle here kneys down bende,
Whan this holy name of ȝow is seyd,

MARIA.

Towneley Plays, p. 351, ll. 316–19, 328–31

Thomas:

Mercy, ihesu, rew on me/my hande is blody of thi blode!
Mercy, ihesu, for I se/thi myght that I not vnderstode!
Mercy, ihesu, I pray the/that for all synfull died on roode!
Mercy, ihesu, of mercy fre/for thi goodnes that is so goode!

LYRIC

Herrigs Archiv, Vol. CIX, p. 42

That now is wet and now is dreye.
for sothe serteyn as I zu say.

now is joye and now is blys.
now is balle and butternesse,
now it is and now it nys:
thus pasyt this word a way.

Now I hope and now I synge,
now I dance and now I sprynge,
now I weyle and now I wrynge:
now is wel and now is way.

Now I hoppe and now I daunce,
now I prike and now I praunce,
this day heyl, te morwe per chaunce
we mown be ded and ley in clay.

Herrig, Vol. CIX, p. 64

M and A and R and I!
syngyn I wyl a newe song.

It were fowre letterys of purposy:
M and A and R and I
tho wern letteris of mary
of hom al our joye sprong.

God that sit aboue the sky
with M and A and R and I,
saue now al this cumpany
and sende vs joye and blysse a in mong!

Herrig, Vol. CVI, p. 60

Jhesu mercy how may this be
That god hymselfe for sole mankynd
wolde take on hym humanitie
my witt nor reson may hit well fynd
Jhesu mercy; abcd: how may this be

DRAMA

Mercy, ihesu, lorde swete/for thi
fyfe woundys so sare,
Thou suffred thrugh handys and
feete/
thi semely side a spere it share;
Mercy, ihesu, lord, yit/for thi
moder that the bare!
Mercy, for the teres thou grett/
when thou rasid lazare!

LYRIC

Jhesu mercy how may this be.
Crist that was of Infynyt myght
Egall to the fathir In deite
Immortal Inpassible the
wordlis lyght
and wolde so take mortalite
Jhesu mercy *ut supra*

Manly, *Specimens*, p. 151

Song I

As I out rode this enderes *night*,
Of thre ioli sheppardes I saw a *sight*,
And all a-bowte there fold *a star*
shone bright;
They sange terli terlow;
So mereli the sheppards ther pipes
can blow.

Song II

Lully, lulla, thou littell tine child,
By by, lully, lullay, thow littell tyne
child,
By by, lully, lullay!

Reliquiae Antiquae, Vol. II, p. 76

This endurs *nyght* I see a *syght*,
A sterre schone bryght as day,
And everymeng a meden song
was *By, by, lulley!*

This lovely lady sete and song,
and tyll hur chyld con say,
"My son, my lord, my fadur deyr,
why lyns thou thus in hey?
My none swete byrd, what art thu kyd
and knowus thi lord of ey?
Never the lesse I will not sesse
to syng, By by, lulley!"

Towneley Plays, p. 368, ll. 33–40

Brymly before vs be thai broght,
oure dedys that shall dam vs bidene;
That eyre has harde, or harte thoght,
that mowthe has spokyn, or ee sene,
That foote has gone or hande wroght,
in any tyme that we may mene;
ffull dere this day now bees it boght.
alas! vnborne then had I bene!

Minor Poems, Ver. MS, p. 785, ll. 8–18

To ofte ich habbe, yn myne lyue,
Ysenghed wit my wittes fyue,
Wit eren yhered, wit eyen syght,
Wit senfold speche dey & nyght,
Wit cleppinges, wit kessenge also,
Wit hondes yhandled, wit fet ygwo,
Wit herte senfolliche ythoght;
Wit al my body euele ywroght;
And of al my (grete) folye,
Mercy, lord, mercy, ich crye!

Towneley Plays, p. 390

Ther is none so styf on stede,
Ne none so prowde in prese,
Ne none so dughty in his dede,
Ne none so dere on deese,
No kyng, no knyght, no Wight in wede,
ffrom dede haue maide hym seese,
Ne flesh he was wonte to fede,
It shall be Wormes mese.

English Miscellany, p. 94

Nis non so riche, ne non so freo.
that hē ne schal heonne. sone áway.
Ne may hit neuer his waraunt beo.
gold. ne seoluer. vouh. ne gray.
Ne beo he no the swift. ne may he fleo
ne weren his lif enne day.
Thus in thes world as thu mayht seo.
al so the schadewe that glyt away.

DRAMA

Towneley Plays, p. 371, ll. 143–47; p. 373, ll. 183–87; p. 376, ll. 296–304; p. 378, ll. 350–367

Of Wraggers and wrears / a bag full of brefes,
Of carpars and cryars / of mychers and thefes,
Of lurdans and lyars / that no man lefys
Of flytars, of flyars / and renderars of reffys;
. . . . . .

Thise rolles
Ar of bakbytars,
And fals quest-dytars,
I had no help of writars
bot thise two dalles.
. . . . . .

yit of thise kyrkchaterars / here are a menee,
Of barganars and okerars / and lufars of symonee,
Of runkers and rowners / god castys thaym out, trulee,
ffrom his temple all sich mysdoers / I cach thaym then to me
ffull soyn;
ffor writen I wote it is
In the gospell, withoutten mys,
Et eam fecistis
Speluncam latronum.
. . . . . .

And ye Ianettys of the stewys / and lychoures on lofte,
youre baill now brewys / avowtrees full ofte,
youre gam now grewys / I shall you set softe,
youre sorow enewes / com to my crofte
All ye;
All harlottys and horres,
And bawdys that procures,
To bryng thaym to lures,
Welcom to my see!

LYRIC

Religious Songs (Percy Society, Vol. XI), p. 81.

Alle bac-biteres
wendet to helle,
Robberes and reveres,
and the mon-quelle;
Lechurs and horlinges
thider sculen wende,
And ther heo sculen wunien
evere buten ende.
Alle theos false chepmen,
the feond heom wule habbe,
Bachares and brueres,
for alle men heo gabbe;
Loghe heo holdet hore galun,
mid berme heo hine fulleth,
And ever of the purse
that selver heo tulleth,
Bothe heo maketh feble
heore bred and heore ale;
Habben heo that selver,
ne tellet heo never tale.

DRAMA

ye lurdans and lyars / mychers n ad thefes,
fflytars and flyars / that all men repre-fes,
Spolars, extorcyonars / Welcom, my lefes!
ffals Iurars and usurars / to symony that clevys,
To tell;
hasardars and dysars,
ffals dedys forgars,
Slanderars, bakbytars,
All vnto hell.

Towneley Plays, p. 373, ll. 206–9; p. 374, ll. 211–21

Tutivillus:

Whi spir ye not, sir / no questyons?
I am oone of youre ordir / and oone of youre sons;
I stande at my tristur / when othere men shones.

I was youre chefe tollare,
And sithen courte rollar,
Now am I master lollar,
And of sich men I mell me.

I haue broght to youre hande / of saules, dar I say,
Mo than ten thowsand / in an howre of a day;
som at ayll-howse I fande / and som of ferray,
som cursid, som bande / som yei, som nay;
so many
Thus broght I on blure,
thus did I my cure.

Towneley Plays, pp. 390 ff.

Ilkon in sich aray / With dede thai shall be dight,
And closid colde in clay / Wheder he be kyng or knyght;
ffor all his garmentes gay / that semely were in sight,

LYRIC

Reliquiae Antiquae, Vol, I, p. 257

TUTIVILLUS

Tutivillus, the devyl of hell,
He wryteth har names, sothe to tel, admissa extrahantes.
Beit wer be at tome for ay,
Than her to serve the devil to pay, sic vana famulantes.
Thos women that sitteth the church about,
Thai beth al of the develis rowte, divina inpotentes.
But thai be stil, he wil ham quell,
With kene strokes draw hem to hell ad patientiam flentes.
For his love that you der bogth,
Hold you stil, and fangel nogth, sordem aperte deprecantes.
The blis of heven than may ye wyn,
God bryng us al to his in,
Amen semper dicentes.

Herrigs Archiv, Vol. CIX, p. 45, xii; p. 46, xvi; and p. 44, vii, ll. 1–14

XII

Synful man for godis sake
I rede that thu amendes make!

thow thu be kyng of tour and town,
thow thu be kyng and were coroun,

DRAMA

his flesh shall frete away / With many a wofull wight.
Then wofully sich wightys
Shall gnawe thise gay knyghtys,
Thare lunges and thare lightys,
Thare harte shall frete in sonder;
Thise masters most of myghtys
Thus shall thai be broght vnder.

Vnder the erthe ye shall / thus carefully then cowche;
The royfe of youre hall / youre nakyd nose shall towche;
Nawther great ne small / To you will knele ne crowche;
A shete shall be youre pall / sich todys shall be youre nowche;
Todys shall you dere,
ffeyndys will you fere,
youre flesh that fare was here
Thus rufully shall rote;
In stede of fare colore
sich bandys shall bynde youre throte.
. . . . . .

Amende the, man, Whils thou may,
let neuer no myrthe fordo thi mynde;
Thynke thou on the dredefull day
When god shall deme all mankynde.
Thynke thou farys as dothe the wynde;
This warlde is wast & and will away;
Man, haue this in thi mynde,
And amende the Whils that thou may.

Amende the, man, whils thou art here,
Agane thou go an othere gate;
When thou art dede and laide on bere,
Wyt thou well thou bees to late;
ffor if all the goode that euer thou gate

LYRIC

I sette ryzt not be thi renown,
but if thu wylt amendys make.

that hast her is other menys
and so it xal ben quan thu art hens,
thi sowle xal a beye thi synnys,
but if thu wit a mendes make.
. . . . . .

man bewar, the weye is sleder;
thu xal slyde, thu wost not qweder;
body and sowle xul go to geder,
but if thu wit a mendes make.

man ber not thi hed to heye
In pumpe and pride and velonye;
In helle thu xalt ben hangyd hye,
but if thu wilt amendes make.

XVI

I drukke I dare so wil I may
quan I thynke on my endys day.

I am a chyld and born ful bare
and bar out this word xal fare,
zyt am I but wermys ware
thow I clothis go neuer so gay.

Thow I be of meche prys,
fayr of face and holdyn wys,
my fleysch xul fadyn as flour de lys
quan I am ded and leyd in clay.

quan I am ded and leyd in ston,
I xal rotyn fleych and bon,
fro myn fryndys I xal gon,
cryst help myn sowle quan I ne may!

Quan I xal al my frendes for sake,
cryst schyld me fro the fendes blake!
to Jesu cryst my sowle I be take,
to be our helpe on domys day!

VII

Gay, gay, gay, gay,
Think on drydful domis day!

DRAMA

Were delt for the after thi day,
In heuen it wolde not mende thi state,
fforthi amende the Whils thou may.

If thou be right ryall in rente,
As is the stede standyng in stall,
In thi harte knowe and thynke
That thai ar goddys goodys all.
he myght haue maide the poore and small
As he that beggys fro day to day;
Wit thou well accountys gif thou shall,
Therfore amende the whils thou may.

Towneley Plays, p. 107, ll. 213–39.

primus pastor.
Set mustard afore,
oure mete now begyns;

here a foote of a cowe / well sawsed, I wene,
The pestell of a sowe / that powderd has bene,
Two blodyngis, I trow / A leueryng betwene;
Do gladly, syrs now / my breder bedene,
With more.
Both befe and moton
Of an ewe that was roton,
Good mete for a gloton;
Ete of this store.

ijus pastor.
I haue here in my mayll / sothen and rost,
Euen of an ox tayll / that wold not be lost;
ha, ha, goderhayll! I let for no cost;
A good py or we fayll / this is good for the frost
In a mornyng;
And two swyne gronys,
All a hare bot the lonys,

LYRIC

Euery day thu myzt lere
to help thi self qwil thu art here.
quan thu art ded and leyd on bere,
cryst help thi sowle for thu ne may!

Think man on thy wyttes fyue,
do sum good qwyl thu art on lyve,
go to cherche and do the schryve
and bryng thi sowle in good aray!

Thynk man on thi synnys seuene,
think how merie it is in heuene,
prey to god with mylde stefne
he be thin helpe on domys day!

Rel. Antiquae, Vol. I, p. 325

BURLESQUE RECEIPT

Take nine pound of thunder, six legs of a swan,
The wool of a frog,
The juice of a log,
Well parboil'd together in the skin of a hog,
With the egg of a moon-calf, if get it you can.
The love of false harlots,
The faith of false varlets,
With the truth of decoys, that walk in their scarlets,
And the feathers of a lobster well fry'd in a pan;
Nine drops of rain,
Brought hither from Spain,
With the blast of a bellows quite over the main;
With eight quarts of brimston, brew'd in a beer can;
Six pottles of lard,
Squeezed from a rock hard,
With nine turkey eggs, each as long as a yard;
With a pudding of hail stones well bak'd in a pan:
These med'cines are good,
And approved have stood,

DRAMA

we myster no sponys
here at oure mangyng.

iijus pastor.
here is to recorde / the leg of a goys,
with chekyns endorde / pork, partryk to roys;
A tart for a lorde / how thynk ye this doys?
A calf lyuer skorde / with veryose;

Y., XLVIII, ll. 229–380

Deus.
Ilke a creature, takes entent,
What bodworde I to you bringe,
This wofull worlde away is wente,
And I am come as crouned kynge.
Mi fadir of heuene, he has me sente,
To deme youre dedis and make ending,
Comen is the day of jugement,
O sorowe may ilke a synfull synge.
The day is comen of kaydyfnes,
All tham to care that are vnclene,
The day of bale and bittirnes,
Full longe abedyn has it bene,
The day of drede to more and lesse,
Of care, of trymbelyng and of tene.
That ilke a wight that weried is
May say, allas! this daye is sene!

. . . . . .

Mi blissid childre on my right hande,
Youre dome this day ye thar not drede,
For all youre comforte is command,
Youre liffe in likyng schall ye lede.
Commes to the kyngdome ay lastand,
That you is dight for youre goode dede,
Full blithe may ye be where ye stande,
For mekill in heuene schall be youre mede.
When I was hungery ye me fedde,
To slake my thirste youre harte was free,
Whanne I was clothles ye me cledde,
Ye wolde no sorowe vppon me see.

LYRIC

Well tempered together with a pottle of blood,
Squeezed from a grasshopper and the nail of a swan.

Pr. of C., ll. 6096–6213.

And delyverd be until the devels powere.
Ful wa sal synful men be that day,
And til helle pyne be put for ay,
And tharfor men may calle that day,
The grete day of delyveraunce,
The day of wreke and of vengeaunce,
The day of wrethe and of wrechednes,
The day of bale and of bitternes,
The day of pleynyng and accusyng,
The day of answer and of strait rekkenyng,
The day of iugements and Iuwys,
The day of angre and of angwys,
The day of drede and of tremblyng,
The day of gretyng and goulyng,
The day of crying and of duleful dyn,
The day of sorow that never sal blyn,
The day of flaying and of afray,
The day of merryng and of myrknes,
That day that es last and that mast es,
The dai when Crist sal make ende of alle;
Thus may nan discryve that day and calle.
Our loverd that alle thyng can se and witt
At the dredeful day of dome sal sitt,
Als kyng and rightwyse domesman,
In dome to deme alle the werld than,
Opon the setil of his magesté.
That day sal alle men byfor hym be,
Bathe gude and ille, mare and les;
Than sal noght be done but rightwysnes.

DRAMA

In harde presse whan I was stedde,
Of my paynes ye hadde pitee,
Full seke whan I was brought in bedde
Kyndely ye come to coumforte me.
Whanne I was wikke and werieste
Ye herbered me full hartefully,
Full gladde thanne were ye of youre geste,
And pleyned my pouerte piteuously.
Be-lyue ye brought me of the beste,
And made my bedde full esyly;
Therfore in heuene schall be youre reste,
In joie and blisse to be me by.

i. an. bona.
Whanne hadde we, lorde, that all has wroght,
Meete and drinke the with to feede?
Sen we in erthe hadde neuere noght
But thurgh the grace of thy godhede.

ii. an bona.
Whanne waste that we the clothes brought,
Or visite the in any nede?
Or in thi sikenes we the sought,
Lorde, when did we the this dede?

Deus.
Mi blissid childir, I schall you saye,
What tyme this dede was to me done,
When any that nede hadde, nyght or day,
Askid you helpe and hadde it sone.
Youre fre hartis saide them neuere nay,
Erely ne late, mydday ne none,
But als ofte sithis as thei wolde praye,
Thame thurte but bide, and haue ther bone.
Ye cursid caytiffis of Kaymes kynne,
That neuere me comforte in my care,
I and ye for euer will twynne,
In dole to dwelle for euermare;
Youre bittir bales shall neuer blynne,

LYRIC

He sal deme al men of ilka degré,
Til ioy or payne that demed sal be,
And rightwyse domes-man and suthefast
And gyf a fynal dome at the last.
Bot how he sal deme I sal shewe,
Als telles the godspelle of Mathewe;
Hys angels than, aftir his wille,
Sal first departe the gude fra the ille,
Als the hird the shepe dus fra the gayte,
That falles to be putt til pastur strayt.
By the shepe understand we may
The gude men that sal be saved that day.
By the gayte understand we may
The ille men, that than dampned sal be.
The gude sal be sette on his right hand,
And the ille on his lefte syde sal stand;
Than sal our loverd say thus that tyde
Til tham that standes on his right syde:
Venite, benedicti patris mei,
possidete paratum nobis regnum
a constitucione mundi.
He sal say than, "commes now til me,
My fadir blissed childer fre,
And weldes the kyngdom that til yhow es dight
Fra first that the werld was ordaynd right."
For I hungerd and yhe me fedde,
I thrested and at drynk yhe me bedde;
Of herber grete nede I had,
Yhe herberd me with hert glad,
Naked I was, als yhe myght se,
Yhe gaf me clathes and clad me;
Seke I was and in ful wayke state,
Yhe wisit me, bathe arly and late;
In prisoun when I was halden stille,
Til me yhe come with ful gude wille.
Than sal the rightwys men that day,
Til our loverd answer thus and say;

DRAMA

That ye shall haue when ye come thare.
Thus haue ye serued for youre synne,
For derffe dedis ye haue done are.
Whanne I had mistir of mete and drynke,
Caytiffis, ye cacched me from youre gate,
Whanne ye were sette as sirs on benke,
I stode ther-oute, werie and wette,
Was none of yowe wolde on me thynke
Pyte to haue of my poure state;
Ther-fore till hell I schall ye synke,
Weele are ye worthy to go that gate.
Whanne I was seke and soriest,
Ye visitte me noght, for I was poure,
In prisoune faste whan I was feste,
Was none of you loked howe I fore.
Whenne I wiste neuere where for to reste,
With dyntes ye draffe me fro your dore,
Butte euer to pride thanne were ye preste,
Mi flessh, my bloode ofte ye for-swore.
Clothles whanne I was ofte, and colde,
At nede of you yede I full naked,
House ne herborow, helpe ne holde,
Hadde I none of you, thof I quaked.
Mi mischeffe sawe ye many-folde,
Was none of you my sorowe slaked,
Butt euere for-soke me, yonge and alde,
Therfore schall ye nowe be for-saked.

i. aia. mala.

Whan had thou, lorde that all thyng has,
Hungir or thirste? sen thou god is,
Whan was thou in prisonne was,
Whan was thou naked or herberles?

ii. aia. mala.

Whan was it we sawe the seke, allas!
Whan kid we the this vnkyndinesse,
Werie or wette to late the passe,
When did we the this wikkidnesse?

LYRIC

'Loverd when saw we the hungry,
And to gyf the mete war we redy;
And when myght we the thresty se,
And gaf the drynk with hert fre;
When saw we the nede of herber have,
And to herber the vouched save;
When saw we the naked and we the cled,
And when saw we the seke and in prison sted,
And visited the with gude wille,
And comforted the, als was skille?'
Our loverd sal than tham answer thus,
And say, als the godspelle shewes us:
'Suthly I say yhou, swa yhe wroght,
That ilka tyme when yhe did oght
Until ane of the lest that yhe myght se
Of my brether, yhe did til me.'
Than sal our loverd til alle thas say,
That than on his lefte syde sal stand that day,
And spek til tham with an austerne chere,
Thir wordes that er hydus to here:
Discedite a me maledicti, in ignem eternum, qui preparatus est diabolo et angelis eius.
"yhe weryed wyghtes wende fra my sight,
Until the endeles fire that es dight
Til the devel and til his aungels."
And than sal he say thus, als the buke tels,
'I hungred and had defaute of mete,
and yhe wald noght gyfe me at ete;
I thrested, and of drynk had nede,
And yhe wald na drynk me bede;
I wanted herber, that I oft soght,
And alle that time yhe herberd me noght;
Naked with-outen clathes I was,
And with-outen clathes yhe let me pas;
Seke I was, and bedred lay,
And yhe visite me nouther nyght ne day;

DRAMA

Deus.
Caistiffis, als ofte als it be-tidde
That nedfull aught askid in my name
Ye herde them noght, youre eris ye hidde,
Youre helpe to thame was noght at hame.
To me was that unkyndines kyd,—
There-fore bere this bittir blame,
To leste or moste whan ye it did,
To me ye did the selue and the same.
Mi chosen childir, comes vnto me,
With me to wonne nowe schall ye wende,
There joie and blisse schall euer be,
Your liffe in lyking schall ye lende,
Ye cursed kaitiffis, fro me ye flee,
In helle to dwelle with-outen ende,
Ther ye schall neuere butt sorowe see
And sitte be Satanas the fende.

LYRIC

In prison I was, als wele wyst yhe
And yhe wald na tyme com til me.'
Than sal thai answere, als men sal here,
Til our loverd, and say on this manere:
"Loverd when saw we the haf hunger or thrist
Or of any herber haf grete brist;
Or naked, or seke, or in prison be,
And we na thyng did ne mynystred to the?'
Than sal our loverd answer ogayne
And say til tham thir wordes certayne:
'Suthly I say yhou, als falles tharto,
Alle tyme that yhe wald noght do
Til ane of lest that myne er kydde,
Als lang til me yhe noght didde.'

GEORGE C. TAYLOR

UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO

HINDU CHIPS FOR READERS OF GOETHE

In Hammer-Purgstall's *Geschichte der schönen Redekünste Persiens* (Wien, 1818), p. 108, the following legend is translated from Nizami's *Machsenol-esrar*, i. e., *Magazin der Geheimnisse:*

Herr Jesus, der die Welt durchwandert,
Ging einst an einem Markt vorbei.
Ein todter Hund lag auf dem Wege,
Geschleppet vor des Hauses Thor.
Es stand ein Haufe um das Aas,
Raubvögeln gleich, die Aeser fressen.
Der eine sprach: Es wird das Hirn
Von dem Gestank ganz ausgelöscht.
Der andre sprach: Was braucht es viel,
Der Gräber Auswurf bringt nur Unglück.
So sang ein Jeder seine Weise,
Des todten Hundes Leib zu schmähen.
Als nun an Jesus kam die Reih',
Sprach ohne Schmähn er guten Sinns,
Er sprach aus gütiger Natur:
Die Zähne sind wie Perlen weiss.
Dies Wort macht den Umstehenden
Verbrannten Muscheln ähnlich, heiss.

As is well known, these verses, with a slight change (in line 6), are found in Goethe's *Westöstlicher Divan: Noten und Abhandlungen—Allgemeines.*

Thus this legend has become common property, and other German writers have retold it.

The same tale occurs in the oldest collection of Jaina stories, in the *Avaçyaka-Erzählungen* (ed. Leumann), Heft I, pp. 34–37. Leumann gives a number of different versions, some older, some younger. The legend is told of Vāsudeva, Viṇhu, Hari, Kaṇha, Kesava, i. e., Vishṇu or Krishṇa, of whom the Jainas have a number of tales.

One day Sakka, the king of the gods, in heaven in the midst of the gods, praised the virtues of Vāsudeva, saying: "Ah, the excellence of superior men like Hari, who only see the good side in men and things,

even if there are a hundred thousand faults!" One of the gods there, not believing this, went to Vāsudeva's city. Vāsudeva had set out on a pilgrimage to worship the Jina. The god assumed the form of a dead dog, black, of hideous aspect, smelling very badly, and thus lay near the road on which Vāsudeva was to return. When Kaṇha together with his retinue came back, all the people of his train covered their faces with their garments, went out of their way, and hurried on. But Vāsudeva walked ahead on the path just as before. When he came up to the carcass, he neither averted nor covered his face, but looked at the teeth of the animal and said: "The teeth of this dead dog are like a row of pearls."

I give this scrap without attempting to discuss the question which of the two stories is derived or borrowed. It is well known that many legends about Jesus occur in Persian literature. As regards Krishṇa, it seems clear that some of the many myths of this god were influenced by Christianity. Especially Albrecht Weber has tried to establish such a dependence. The sources of Nizami, the Muhammedan legends of Jesus, the relation between Christ and Krishṇa—all of these things have to be carefully investigated before the priority either of the Hindu or of the Persian version of our legend can be established, provided, of course, that no Indian form which clearly goes back to a time before Christ can be produced.

The reader will have noticed the resemblance of this story to Goethe's *Prolog im Himmel* and to the beginning of the Book of Job, which furnished the German poet with the model. But in this case I do not believe in a *nexus causalis* at all. The idea (conversation in heaven—disbelief—trial of the great or good) is natural enough, so that it can have sprung up independently in different lands and times. Compare *Indische Studien*, XV, pp. 410–17. Some of the parallels, however, given there by Weber, are no real parallels. I subjoin another Jaina story, in a work of later date and published in Jacobi's *Ausgewählte Erzählungen in Māhārāshtrī*, pp. 26, 27:

And one day the Indra of Sohamma, seated on his throne in the assembly hall of Sohamma, was seeing the play *Soyāmini*. At this juncture a god from the Isāna heaven whose name was Samgama, came to the Indra of Sohamma. And by the brightness of his body the splendor of all the gods present in the assembly hall vanished; as the stars at the rising of the sun, so the immortals became lusterless. When he had gone,

the astonished immortals questioned the Indra of Sohamma as follows: "Why, O Lord, has this god Samgama a splendor surpassing that of twelve sunrises?" Indra said: "In a former life he performed the penance called ayambilabaddamāna." Then the gods again questioned Indra as follows: "Is there also another who is endowed with such splendor and beauty?" Indra said: "In Hatthināura, in the Kuru race, there is a universal sovereign, Saṇamkumāra by name, whose splendor and beauty surpass even that of the gods." Thereupon the gods Vijaya and Vejayanta, not believing this, went in the form of Brahmans. Thereupon admitted by the doorkeeper they entered into the presence of the king. And they saw the king occupied in annointing himself with perfume and oil. They were astonished to see a perfection of beauty and other excellences even greater than the splendor of beauty described by Indra. And they were asked by the king: "Why have you come here?" They said: "Your beauty is being praised in the three worlds; from curiosity to see it (we come)." And again the king, proud of his extreme beauty, addressed them: "Hear, hear, O Brahmans! how could you have seen my beauty! Wait a little while till I enter the hall of audience." "Yes," said the Brahmans and went out. But the universal sovereign quickly bathed, and having put on ornaments, finery, and an elegant dress, he sat down on the throne. The Brahmans were called. When they saw his body they were sad. And they said: "Alas, that the beauty, grace, and youthful bloom of men should be seen one moment and then vanish!" Hearing this the universal monarch said: "Hear! why do you, utterly plunged in sorrow, find fault with my body?" They said: "Great king, the beauty, youthful bloom, and splendor of the gods remain from the first moment till only six months of their life are left; then they diminish. Those of men, on the other hand, increase till the middle of life has come; thereupon they wane. But a miracle is seen in regard to the brilliancy of your beauty and youthful bloom, for even now it has vanished in a moment like the friendship of a villain." The king said: "How do you know?" They told him the matter, beginning with the praises of Indra. And astonished he looked at his two arms, bedecked with armlets, and saw that they were dim; and he noticed that his breast also, adorned with the pearl necklace, was wan. And he reflected: "Alas for the instability of the samsāra! Alas for the vanity of the body! Even in such a short time beauty, youthful bloom, and splendor have disappeared. Therefore attachment to existence is not meet."

The king goes on descanting further on the vanity and inanity of life, bids farewell to kingship and realm, and becomes a wandering ascetic.

JOHN J. MEYER

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

FRIEDRICH HEINRICH JACOBI'S HOME AT PEMPELFORT

Jacobi's home at Pempelfort can best be compared with Gleim's "Tempel der Freundschaft" at Halberstadt. Jacobi had a similar longing to gather about him all masters of literature and philosophy. He did not, like Gleim, however, as a protector of younger talents, earn for himself the title of "Father of Literature," nor did he try to inspire all his protégés in a certain unhealthy direction, like Gleim, who forever harped upon his Anacreon and tried to influence his followers toward falsely sentimental and absurd lyrics. While aiding his friends as much as he could, Jacobi mainly sought inspiration for himself from his associations. In a letter to Marianne (I, 328; July, 1770) he characterizes his choice of friends thus: "Who then has not what I need, nor needs what I have, is and remains a stranger to me. Surreptitious, feigned, theatrical friendship—I know nothing more despicable."

His letters show that he always knew how to profit from each new acquaintance, and that he was anxious to teach and help wherever he could. His friends were a necessary factor in his life. Though he showed himself capable of earnest research, yet to be at all productive, direct incitation from one interested in his work was absolutely necessary. His first work was not commenced until Goethe had repeatedly urged him to produce some original writing, and all his other essays are written directly to friends, mostly as personal letters.

Jacobi's relation as a philosopher to his contemporaries has been repeatedly outlined by such men as Dykes, Zirngiebl, Schaumberg, and others. I therefore wish to give a general picture of his home at Pempelfort, to show how he gathered about him the best talents of his day, and perhaps to find some reason for his popularity.

Friedrich H. Jacobi was the son of a well-to-do merchant of Düsseldorf. He therefore received a careful training, but one so colored with religious and fantastic elements that at fifteen he was

a devout Pietist, a lonely dreamer. His father was rather pleased with his saintly ways, but when he wished him to be of some assistance at the sugar plant, he found him utterly worthless. Friedrich was therefore sent to Geneva, to enjoy a more thorough education and to lose his dreamy ways in the society of stronger men. There the mathematician and philosopher LeSage especially helped to give his mind a more practical turn, and when Jacobi returned to Düsseldorf in 1762, he was not only more refined, more practical, and improved in health, but he had learned to do independent thinking and research, which enabled him to defend his peculiar philosophy even against such men as Kant, Hegel, and Schelling.

With good success he took hold of his father's business, and soon after married Betty von Clermont, the daughter of a wealthy merchant of Aachen. He was now in position to realize his favorite ambition and gather friends at his home who could help him forget the tedious hours of factory life.

Through his persistent efforts he soon became acquainted with many men who played important parts in the development of the literature of the times. Seldom did a stranger who had come to visit the art galleries or the newly established academy at Düsseldorf leave the town without having called at Pempelfort, where a cordial reception promised a pleasant and profitable entertainment. Sometimes the house was literally overcrowded with visitors, but seldom did Jacobi complain of it as in a letter to Wieland of May 29, 1774:

> Since yesterday my house must lodge ten guests; every corner is taken. But this would mean little; gladly would I surrender more, if I but could remain master of my own skin. But that, too, must go; and since it must be so, I will give it cheerfully, so that I may feel as though I take a pleasure in so doing.

His circle of acquaintances made his business obligations weigh more and more heavily upon him, so that when his friend, the Count of Goltstein, governor of the Rhine Province and Westphalia, offered him a position as *Hofkammerrat*, "secretary of the chamber," with a special supervision over the tax system, he gladly accepted, since at this time he was successfully occupying

himself with the study of various branches of political economy, and the new position gave him more leisure to devote to his friends.

The first of his great contemporaries to enter Jacobi's circle was Wieland. Jacobi had first made the acquaintance of Wieland through his older brother, Johann Georg, whom Wieland had greatly assisted in the development of his lyrics; but they became intimate only after the personal meeting at the home of their mutual friend, Sophia von Laroche, in Ehrenbreitstein. The letter in which Jacobi describes this meeting is filled with that excess of sentimentality which still was prevalent in the literature of the age. There are the usual flood of tears, the extravagance of emotion and embrace, and the solemn vows always to remain the best of friends. During the next few years it seemed as though these vows were really sincere. Wieland spent considerable time at Pempelfort laying great plans for co-operating with Jacobi in new literary enterprises. Jacobi, on the other hand, was devoting himself more and more to his popular philosophy, and from Wieland's *Agathon* had reason to believe that he had found a friend who could be of some assistance to him in this direction. The first and only important result of their plans was the beginning of the *Deutsche Merkur*, of which Jacobi seems to have been the original promoter, though his enthusiasm was of but short duration. Two years after the first number had appeared (1774) we find that the friends had already practically separated. Jacobi had not found in Wieland the popular philosopher he had looked for, and therefore his interest soon died away. It seems as though he used every small dissension to widen the breach which had been brought about by a criticism published by Wieland in the *Merkur*, in which he spoke favorably of a novel by Fr. Nicolai in which Johann Georg Jacobi was mercilessly derided. This founding of the *Merkur*, however, is of sufficient importance to make the friendship of Jacobi and Wieland a memorable one. In this periodical appeared Jacobi's first philosophical work, *Allwills Brief-Sammlung*, and by bringing together as contributors many of the best-known and most popular men of the period it greatly helped to increase Jacobi's popularity.

Among the guests at Pempelfort as early as 1773 we find Diderot, who had just completed his encyclopaedia. Jacobi praises his fiery spirit and his bold and quick wit, but believes that it is not a predominating sense for beauty and truth which stamps him as a genius, if he in truth be a genius at all.

Soon afterward, Goethe, who had just attracted the attention of the whole literary world through his *Goetz von Berlichingen*, became intimately attached to Jacobi. This was the friendship of which Jacobi was proudest, which benefited him most, and which, with few insignificant interruptions, lasted till the end of his life. The relations of Goethe with Jacobi have, however, been so thoroughly exhausted by the biographers of Goethe and in writings on Jacobi that I shall pass them by with this mere mention. The fact, however, that Goethe allied himself so closely with Jacobi and for a long time sent him his manuscripts for the first criticism, mostly following his advice very closely, proves sufficiently that Jacobi was a man of no ordinary ability and judgment. Goethe also derived much benefit from Jacobi, especially in the earlier days of their friendship. By Jacobi he was first introduced more thoroughly into the philosophy of Spinoza. Jacobi, on the other hand, owed practically his whole literary career to Goethe. Goethe induced him to undertake to write his first philosophic treatise, and during the rest of his life furnished that incentive without which Jacobi would probably have remained forever silent.

At this point it may be of interest to quote a passage from Johann Georg Jacobi's diary (as yet little known), describing his first meeting with Goethe:

> H. Goethe hat mich in öffentlichen Blättern empfindlich beleidigt, aber auch hat er das Trauerspiel *Goetz von Berlichingen* geschrieben. Wir gaben uns die Hand. Ich sah einen der ausserordentlichsten Männer, voll hohen Genies, glühender Einbildungs-Kraft, tiefer Empfindung, rascher Laune, dessen starker, dann und wann riesenmässiger Geist einen ganz eigenen Gang nimmt. Seine Tafel-Reden hätt' ich aufzuzeichnen gewünscht.

Soon after, Klopstock also appears among Jacobi's friends. At first Jacobi seems to have been very enthusiastic over him, so that

Wieland grew jealous and wrote: "Goethe and Klopstock have taken possession of your soul, and next to these there is no place for Wieland." Klopstock, however, never visited Pempelfort, and in literary fields Jacobi, who was especially interested in the most modern movements, met rarely with Klopstock.

Another of his great contemporaries whom Jacobi tried in vain to entice to Pempelfort was Lessing. Lessing had first come into touch with the Pempelfort circle through Johann Georg Jacobi, who often passed through Wolfenbüttel, where Lessing resided at the time. In an attempt to bring about a more intimate friendship, Jacobi sent Lessing a copy of *Woldemar*, his latest work. This Lessing criticized very favorably, and in return sent Jacobi a copy of *Nathan der Weise.* In 1780 Jacobi spent some time with Lessing in Wolfenbüttel, discussing with him his favorite topic, the philosophy of Spinoza. He found Lessing discontented and in poor health and urged him to come to Pempelfort, offering to put a whole suite of rooms at his disposal. Lessing, however, did not accept, and, as he died soon after, Jacobi had no opportunity to renew his invitation. In his letters to Mendelssohn and in his treatise, "Was Lessing a Follower of Spinoza?" Jacobi gives a detailed account of their first meeting at Wolfenbüttel.

With others Jacobi was more fortunate. In the next few years we find enrolled among his guests such names as Amalia von Gallitzin, Hemsterhuys, Lavater, Dohm, Forster, Hamann, Count Stolberg and his brother, Countess Julia Reventlow, Gleim, and others—representatives of the most varied literary movements.

As the last stragglers of passing Anacreonticism, Johann Georg Jacobi and Gleim imagined the large and beautiful garden at Pempelfort turned into an Elysium, and in the little muddy Düssel brook they saw the nymphs and muses necessary to inspire them to their sentimental rimes. Johann Georg even succeeded in making a boat-ride on this streamlet the occasion for one of the best of his little ditties:

Bei der stillen Mondes-Helle
Treiben wir mit frohem Sinn
Auf dem Bächlein, ohne Welle,
Hin und her und her und hin.

Schifflein! gehst und kehrest wieder
Ohne Segel, ohne Mast;
Bächlein! trägst uns auf und nieder,
Spielend mit der kleinen Last.

Nichts zu fürchten, nichts zu meiden
Ist, so weit das Auge sieht.
Flüstert leis! ihr jungen Weiden!
Mädchen! singt ein Abendlied!

Denn zu Ruhm und eitlen Schätzen
Lockt uns nicht das ferne Meer;
Suchen friedliches Ergötzen,
Schwimmen unbekannt umher.

Mädchen! gebt des Herzens Freuden,
Wenn ihr sicher leben wollt,
Gebt sie, mässig und bescheiden,
Nicht um Ehre, nicht um Gold.

Treues Lieben und Gefallen
Sei mit reiner Lust gepaart,
Und, wie dieses Schiffleins Wallen,
Ruhig einst die letzte Fahrt!

The *Mädchen* who were at Pempelfort from time to time, and to whom Jacobi directed his flatteries, were among the foremost blue-stockings of the day.

In March, 1781, Princess Amalia of Gallitzin, the former Countess of Schmettow, came to Pempelfort with Hemsterhuys—Diotema with her Diocles, as Jacobi called them. This peculiar woman had withdrawn wholly from court circles, while her husband served as Russian ambassador at The Hague, and built a country home, which she called "Niet t' Huys" ("not at home"), there to devote herself wholly to her literary hobbies, surrounded by a circle of literary men. Jacobi visited her at this place; she returned the visit; and remained at Pempelfort for a week, during which time she modeled a bust of Jacobi, while Hemsterhuys drew a pen-sketch of him, which are still considered by many the best likenesses we have of Jacobi.

Sophia von Laroche was a frequent guest at Pempelfort. Her moralistic novels, that made her at the time the most popular blue-stocking, very likely suggested to Jacobi the form for his *Alwill*

and *Woldemar*. She was also for some time the go-between for Jacobi and Goethe, and helped much in bringing about their friendship. Countess Julia Reventlow also joined the circle. The women, however, who helped most to make Jacobi's home attractive were those of his own household. Foremost among these was Jacobi's wife, Betty, whom Goethe describes as a "splendid woman from the Netherlands, without a touch of sentimentality, of correct judgment, pleasant in conversation, without an expression of sensuality, and whose sturdy nature reminds one of Rubens' women."

Betty and Jacobi's sister, Charlotte, were by Goethe considered especially adapted to adjust the difference which then existed between the North and the South German poets, the former of whom still showed a predominance of sentimentality and sensibility, while the latter were characterized by coarseness and a sharp and at times insulting wit. And nowhere could Goethe study these characteristics to better advantage than at Pempelfort, where he found men from both classes assembled.

That Betty was the center of interest almost as much as Jacobi himself can best be seen from the general sorrow which her early death caused among all who had been her guests. Jacobi himself was almost despondent. To his brother-in-law, Johann Arnold von Clermont, he writes:

> Our saint, my friend, has departed. I pray to her, and she helps me. Her spirit has not left me, and it demands that I console you. Betty lives!—She lives, and I have now what I demanded from heaven, a sign of immortality and God; and she, whose whole being was sacrifice, this saint has died, to give me this sign, to bear me this witness, that I might remain with her forever!

To Johanna Fahlmer, an aunt of Jacobi and a mutual friend of Goethe and himself, at this time married to Georg Schlosser, he writes:

> I saw the countenance of an angel, and am certain that she knew in the last moment that her way led toward heaven and that she could bring bliss upon mankind.

Finally, to his new friend Hamann he says:

> I had lived with her for twenty years, from my twenty-first year on, and have never seen anyone whom I could compare with her in purity, grandeur of heart, love, or truthfulness.

Of the letters written to Jacobi, that of Herder is perhaps worthy of mention. He writes:

I am silent to your pain and feel wholly your wound, because, even if not from a personal meeting, yet from descriptions I know your departed friend as though she stood before me. But compose yourself; be a man, a philosopher, a Christian. The last will console you most. We go about here in disguise, and first after uncovering do we become what we should and shall be.

After Betty's death a marked change took place in Jacobi. What up to this time he had gathered through actual experience, through the meeting with his friends, or from books, he now used as a weapon against what seemed to him the ever more predominant realistic tendencies. Of this enemy he became a zealous opponent, with Herder and Hamann as his trusted associates. In endless work he tried to kill the slowly passing time. In 1785 he began the discussion with Mendelssohn as to whether Lessing was a follower of Spinoza. He also left Pempelfort oftener, and devoted much of his time to the study of Kant. He corresponded extensively with Lavater, with whom he became very intimate, and also with Georg Forster, who at that time resided in Göttingen because the Crimean War had kept him from undertaking his trip around the world, on an appointment which he had received from Katherine of Russia.

Soon, however, Jacobi received as his guest at Pempelfort Hamann, whom he esteemed highly as his most faithful co-worker. On August 12, 1787, Hamann first appeared at Pempelfort to exchange ideas with his friend and in the hope of obtaining some rest for his overstrung nerves. Hamann had been used to the simplest of lives, devoid of all comforts, and could hardly feel at home in the comfortable and over-hospitable abode of Jacobi. For almost six weeks he remained at Pempelfort, during which time numerous visitors arrived to be introduced to the strange guest. When finally it became colder and Jacobi's sister offered to provide him with warmer clothing, he secretly disappeared. Not until five weeks after did he write to Jacobi to excuse his flight:

Have you not noticed, dear Jonathan, that the two Amazons have conspired, in spite of my old age, to rob me of all my philosophy, and of all your favorite prejudice for it upon which our friendship rests. I have

been received into your house as an angel from heaven. Should I then attribute this exertion and extravagance of piety only to my need, or not more to your prejudice for friendship? True thankfulness is invincible and satisfies neither through bows nor through words. It turns its back on the object of its admiration, and does not wish to be seen.

But Jacobi had profited much from Hamann's visit, and his correspondence with his new friend was the greatest help to him in his work. To Lavater he describes this visit:

I cannot express to you how this association with Hamann has made me believe most improbable things. A true Παν is this man, in harmony and disharmony, in light and darkness, in spiritualism and materialism.

As often as Jacobi remained at Pempelfort for any length of time he was immediately overrun with guests. During only two months of 1789 his letters tell of visits from Herr von Clermont, Princess Gallitzin, Minister von Fürstenberg, Hemsterhuys, Buchholz with his entire family, Baron von Gleichen, Prince Gallitzin, Count Windisch-Grätz, and above all Wilhelm von Humboldt. Humboldt stayed at Pempelfort several days, and on his departure Jacobi gave him a letter of introduction to Lavater, saying: "His speculative mind, his extraordinary intellect, will delight you. I think him a man of the highest intelligence."

This gathering of illustrious friends makes Jacobi's garden a most interesting spot for the student of the eighteenth century. The greater part of the garden is still preserved and is now owned by the Malkasten Verein. Of Jacobi's house only a part is standing, but the garden is preserved almost as he himself planned it in 1790. In the farthest corner to the right is an old tree in which many of the guests cut their names, and among these that of Goethe can still be clearly recognized.

The popularity of Gleim is attributed mainly to the fact that he was a man of abundant resources, which he used to act the part of a Maecenas, and that his friends never turned to him in vain for help in any of their enterprises. As reasons for Jacobi's popularity, on the other hand, usually are mentioned his magnificent character, his intense interest in every branch of literature, and the broad and clear view in his criticisms. His friendship with Goethe, and even more his lucid criticism of Kant, prove

sufficiently that he had all these qualities in no slight degree. Yet his wealth and his excessive generosity must also have been a great drawing-card for many of the men who gathered at Pempelfort. This is perhaps but little believed. Some of his biographers even say that he spent most of his money in keeping his garden and house comfortable for his guests, and that he had little left wherewith to play the Maecenas. We know, however, that he supplied abundant money to keep the *Merkur* well under way, and also that he sent Heinse to Italy for three years to finish his *Ardinghello.* Besides, there was a marked falling-off in Jacobi's popularity after he was forced to give up Pempelfort in 1795 and became a man of only moderate means.

A manuscript which I succeeded in acquiring about two years ago helps to throw light on the reason for his popularity. It is a simple ledger of Jacobi's accounts during a few of his last years at Pempelfort. It shows that he was spending sums far beyond his income, to allow his friends to enjoy every possible luxury, and that besides he was loaning money freely to his friends, and in his accounts noted these items as loans which he never expected would be paid back to him. His common expenses alone, not including these so-called loans, for not fully four years show a diminution in capital of 12,000 reichsthalers, which would amount to about $36,000, assuming that money had at that time at least three times the purchasing value of today. Some idea of the sort of reception he offered his guests can best be gotten from his wine account which for the single year of 1790 amounted to 625 thalers, which, again considering the purchasing value of money in those days and the fact that Jacobi lived on the Rhine, would be equivalent to at least $2,000. His book account for the four years 1788–91 was 2,805 thalers, much of which must also be considered as a simple patronage of his friends.

The most interesting item, however, is the list of direct loans for the year 1791 which he never expected would be paid back. One Leuchsenring, very likely a young literary aspirant, heads the list with a loan of 4,246 thalers; Professor Werthes, 978; Laroche, 546.40; Forster, 240; Mahler Müller, 166. The loans of that year alone amounted to 6,177 thalers.

Surely Gleim, with his moderate salary, could not afford to act the Maecenas to any such extent. But Jacobi made no show of his generosity, for in his letters we find hardly a trace of that which the ledger discloses. Even when, on account of this liberal aid to his friends, his property was reduced to a dangerously small capital, he did not turn to them for help, but succeeded through his own efforts in obtaining the presidency of the Academy of Sciences in Munich, which again made it possible for him to lead the life he had accustomed himself to. But his home at Pempelfort he was obliged to let pass into the hands of strangers.

OTTO MANTHEY-ZORN

AMHERST COLLEGE

GALAHAD AND PERCEVAL

FROM THE "TRISTAN" MS ADD. 5474, FF. 142 c – 164 b BRITISH MUSEUM *

(Sir Thomas Malory's *Le Morte Darthur*, Books XI and XII)

I

Me sire tristran[1] qui en la ioieuse garde demouroit toutes uois auoec la roine yseut estoit auques apareillies entour la pasque[2] auoit grant uolente quil sen alast el roiaume de loenois seiourner tout cel este. & la roine si estoit bien acordee. mais puis que tristran entendi que li rois enuoioit ses lettres a tous ceus qui de li tenoient terre & leur mandoit quil tenroit sa court a kamaalot la plus riche que il onques tenist. quant tristran ot ces noueles il dit quil ne se mouuera huimais du roiaume de logres deuant quil aura ueue ceste court. & pour ce remest il adont & dist quil ira sans faille il nel laira en nule maniere quil ne soit de cest acort. car il pense bien quil i ara haute cheualerie & grant afaire i porra ueoir por ce dist tristan quil demoura el roiaume de logres por ueoir ceste feste que li rois doit tenir. il demande a ma dame yseut sele uenra a ceste court por ceste grande feste a ueoir ou toutes les dames de ualour & toutes les damoiseles du roiaume de logres verront. sire fait ele vostre grace iou nirai mie mais vous i porrois bien aler sil vous plaist por ce que vous estes compains de la taule reonde. dame fait il comment uous laisseroie iou si loing de moi. vous reuenrois tost se dieu plaist fait ele. dame fait il que uous diroie iou plus. or sachies bien puis que vous ni uoles uenir iou nirai pas sire fait ele si ferois se dieu plaist. & vous dirai por coi iou uoeil que uous iaillies. or sachies que tant que vous serrois hors de chaiens iou naurai cose qui me plaise car iou ne porroie viure sans vous puis que iou sui hors de cornuaille. & toutes uois me plaist il que uous a ceste fois i aillois a kamaalot. & si uous dirai pour coi ie uoeil que vous i aillois.

Jou ai tant oi de ceste court parler as uns & as autres que iou sai uraiement quil ne puet estre que ceste court ne soit sans faille la plus rice & la plus haute qui onques fust ueue el roiaume de logres par nul roi crestien. bien sai que tuit li cheualier du roiaume de logres iuerront quil nen demourra ia vn seul que venir i puise en nule guise. & quant il seront tuit a ceste feste & vos amis qui estes li plus preus de tous & tous li mieudres cheualiers del monde ne series donc auoec eus que diroient il.

* [As the Introduction to this text presupposes the existence of an article by Dr. Sommer, "The Queste of the Holy Grail," which will appear in a forthcoming number of *Romania*, it has been deemed better to let the introduction follow, rather than precede, the text.— Eds.]

[1] Rarely written in extenso in this MS and then always "Tristran."

[2] ? omitted here, "& " or "si."

il vous tenroient a maluais & diroient [*col. d*] tout plainement que uous series recreus de bien faire por lamor yseut la roine de cornuaille il diroient que uous aries abaisse toute droiture & pour moi vous en series a hontes. & ie deshonoree de lautre part. il diroient tuit mal de moi & de vous honte. or gardes sil est boin que nous eschieuon cest blasme. ma dame fait tristran. gre & graces uous en rent de ce que vous me faites connoistre lounor de moi mies que iou ne le connissoie. or connois iou certainement que vous mames & baes a lounor de moi por ceste parole que uous maues orendroit dite irai iou sans faille a la cort car bien sai se iou nestoie celui iour a la cort le roi artu quant tuit li autre i seront assamble quil diroient de moi uilounie & de uous le diroient il ausi & pour abaissier cest blasme irai iou iusques la & reuenrai tost a vous sil vous plaist & adieu ausi. iou uoeil bien que vous sachies que puis que iou me serai partis de vous iou ne porrai bien auoir ne ioie por nule auenture del monde deuant que ie soie a uous reuenus.

Sire fait ele iou quit bien que vous poes desoremais bien mouuoir sil vous plaist. car vous saues bien quil en est tans. & il dist quil mouera uenredi ou samedi. ne mencaut mais que iou soie a kamaalot le iour de la feste. sire fait ele il mest auis que se vous tant atendes que vous ni porrois atans uenir iusques la a .iiii. boines iournees ce dient cil de cest pais. dame dist or ne uous esmaies que iou demourai iusques atant que iou vous di & si verrai mout bien atans a celui ior car iou nirai mie armes fors despee & de glaue seulement ne ne menrai nul escuier auoec moi. iou uoeil uenir entreus si soudainement quil en soient tuit merueilliet & esbahi. iou uoeil venir a cele feste com cheualiers auentureus. sire fait ele or oi iou merueilles ia saues uous certainement quil a el roiame de logres maint cheualier qui vous sont mortel anemi que sil auenoit par auenture quil uous trouuaissent desarme il vous feroient tost anui sil pooient.

Dame fait il ce ne puet estre que iou soie de tous ames. car maint cheualier ai outre darmes puis que iou vinc el roiaume de logres qui encore me portent haine ne ne sui mie li plus boins cheualiers del monde ne li plus ames. mais bien sachies dame que iou uoeil aler en tel guise com ie vous di & bien sachies que ie [*fol. 143, col. a*] nen porterai nule arme fors que mespee seulement ne naies doute que de ceste uoie ne me puet uenir se bien non ne li cuers nel me dit pas. sire fait ele diex le uoeille

Atant finent leur parlement. tristran demeure tant com li plot auoec sa dame. & quant il uoit quil ni puet plus demourer & que ceuauchier lesteut hastieuement sil uieut uenir a la feste. il prent de sa dame congiet & monte & sen part de la ioieuse garde & commenche aceuauchier tous seul sans nule compaignie. & il estoit si bien montes qua celi tans ne peust on mie trouer .i. meillour cheual en tout le monde & la ou il

ceuauchoit ensi sans compaignie li auint adonc vne auenture mout merueilleuse quil encontra en mi vne lande palamedes tout apareillie de ses armes. quant palamedes uoit tristran lomme el monde quil het plus morteument il li uait maintenant a lencontre au ferir des esperons il li est auis qua cestui point puet il tristran occirre sil le vieult faire. car tristan est tous desarmes fors descu & de glaiue & despee. tant seulement. il naura ia encontre lui duree sil se vieut abandoner a lui metre a mort quant tristran uoit palamedes qui ensi li vient a lencontre si abandoneement tout maintenant li ciet au cuer que cou est palamedes sans faille & palamedes li crie auques de loing. certes tristran vous estes mors quant vous de mes mains escaperes iamais ne ferrois coup de lance. or vous ai iou troue apoint

Quant tristran ot ceste nouele il sareste tout maintenant & set bien que cou est palamedes li plus fors cheualiers del monde & li plus grans anemis quil ait. diex fait il que ferai iou en contre lui que iou nai armes. se iou me desfent ma desfense ne uaura riens. ce sai iou bien car trop est preus palamedes. palamedes auant quil uenist a tristran auoit abatu .i. cheualier & naure trop durement. encore gisoit illeuc li cheualiers. tristran ce dist palamedes tuies hounis tes daarrains iors est venus. palamedes ce dist tristran. bien saches que de ce nai iou nule paour. iou nai garde de toi. si mait diex por ce que tu i es armes me quides tu espoenter si de legier. iou sui tristran qui hui cest iour uous honirai & plus vilainement que cheualiers ne fu onques honis. car tout soies tu armes & iou desarmes si ne porras tu durer encontre moi. iou te conquerrai a honor de moi & tu morras a honte. huimais te gardes bien de moi que tu [*fol. 143, col. b*] wideras les arcons se iou onques puis. quant il a dite ceste parole il ni fist autre demourance ains laisse courre a palamedes si tost comme il puet du cheual traire si le fiert si durement quil fait son glaiue uoler enpieches. mais de la sele nel remue mie. car de grant force estoit Palamedes & trop ceuauchoit bien. il ne se remuet enuers tristran. ne ne fait onques nul samblant quil se uoeille remuer. quant tristran uoit palamedes & il uoit le samblant quil uait faisant & uoit quil ne se remue il quide quil fust tous esbahis. por ce li dist adont palamedes. comment te va ies tu mors. tes ore si faillis li cuers que uers moi ne toses desfendre.

Palamedes respont adont ensouriant tristran or uoi iou bien que tu afoletis tous les iours. plus ies faus que tu ne fus awan & plus le seras. palamedes ce dist tristran se iou sui fols iou puis dire de toi que tu ies plus maluais asses & plus couars & plus fols que tu ne soloies estre tu ne toses de moi desfendre ce uoi iou bien apertement. tristran ce dist palamedes quides tu se diex te saut que iou te lais a asaillir pour paour que iou aie de toi bien saces tu deuoir que non fais. bien ses tu de quel renomee iou ai este iusques chi & de ceus qui me counoissent ai iou renon

& se iou por poi de cose perdoie ce que iou ai conqueste maluaisement feroie adonc le mien afaire. or me di se diex te saut verite de ce que ie te demanderai. volentiers certes ce dist tristran. se ce est chose que iou doiue dire. se tu ce dist palamedes fuisses armes ausi com iou sui & tu trouaisses .i. tien anemi desarme & desgarni se diex te doinst boine auenture lasaudroies tu ou tu len lairoies aler.or me di que tu endeueroies faire si tu baoies a honor.

Palamedes ce dist tristran or uoi iou bien a coi tu bees & quant tu me demandes que iou feroie en tel auenture dun mien anemi iou le te dirai maintenant. saches tu que iou len lairoie aler que ia autre fait nen feroie. car iou verroie bien apertement que iou ne porroie plus grant couardise faire ne plus grant maluaistie que dassaillir men anemi mortel a i cel point que iou fuisse armes & il desarmes & sil tasaloit fait palamedes quen feroies tu. ie men partiroie de lui fait tristran se iou pooie que alui ne meteroie iou plus main se ce nestoit seulement [*col. c*] pour mon cors desfendre. tristran ce dist palamedes iou tai fait iugier por moi tu meesmes gardes monor tu as parle a cestui point comme loiaus cheualiers & sages & enseignies. mais ce doi iou faire de toi qui es mon anemi & saches que tout ensi le ferai iou ne autrement ne le pensoie iou afaire. tout leusses tu autrement dit tristran or saces tu bien que iou ne uoeil mie perdre lonor que iou ai conquise por toi honir de ta mort ne me verroit mie si grant preu[1] quil peust abatre la honte que iou conquesteroie a cestui point. & por ce di iou que iou men uoeil a tant soufrir de uengier moi de la haine que iou ai a toi. vue autre foiz par auenture te trouuerai en meilleur point. que cesti nest. se ta as ta lance brisie sour moi iou men souferrai a ceste fois. cariou uengerai bien cesti courous. or ten pues aler quitement mais se auenture taporte vne autre fois entre mes mains & tu soies armes saches a donc seroit cou fait que moi ou toi morions

Quant tristran entent la frankise que palamedes li fait il le tient a trop grant merueille. il ne peust mie deuant croire quil le feist ensi. car ce sauoit il bien por uoir que palamedes le haoit morteument. & quant il le trouua a cest point si durement a mesure. il le tient a trop grant merueille. tristran ce dist palamedes or saches que iou nel fais mie por toi ne por grant bien que iou te uoeille. ains le fais por monor garder que ie ne me vauroie mie honir por toi ne por autrui que iou peusse. mais or me die se diex te saut ou uas tu ore en cest point si seus sans compaignie & desarmes. certes ce dist tristran iou menuois a kamaalot. car si comme iou croi isont assanle tout li meillor cheualier del monde qui crestien sont or mi conuient estre demain pour cou que tuit li cheualier de la table reonde isont. & pour cou que iou auoie trop avenir. ne uenir ni peusse pas apoint puis que iou alaisse armes. por ce iuois iou ensi desarmes comme tu uois pour estre acele haute feste.

[1] MS "peu."

Certes ce dist palamedes chil ceuaus sour cui tu sies me samble trop traueillies ce mest auis. mais iou te di que tu feras. chis ceuax sour cui iou sui est par le mien ensiant tous li mieudres & li plus fors qui soit el roiaume de logres & li rois artus lauoit mout chier & lamoit sor tous autres cheuaus. car iou le conquis cest an [*col. d*] a son cors meesmes. & sachies que iou me combati alui plus pour le couuoitise du cheual auoir que pour autre cose que te diroie iou tant ai cest ceual esprouue & counois son grant pooir que iou sai uraiement se nus te doit porter a kamaalot uistement cist ti portera sans doute. de che me croi por ce uoeil iou que nous descendons andui & sil te plaist tu prenderas mon ceual & iou le tien. tu feras miex del mien que del tien. quant tristran ot ceste parole & il uoit la cortoisie que palamedes li fait. il endeuient tous esbahis il regarde palamedes & son ceual & puis le suen & tant quil vise bien ason avis que palamedes li dist uoir. palamedes ce dist tristran tu me fais tout merueillier des paroles que tu me dis. il mest auis que iou ne peusse estre si courtois uers toi que tu ies uers moi. tristran ce dist palamedes. se tu ne pues estre courtois damages est & hontes a toi car il nest nus hom el monde estrais de si haut lignage pour coi dedens soi fust herbergie si haute cheualerie comme il a dedens toi que toute franchise & toute courtoisie ne deust estre en lui & quant tu ies teus cheualiers comme iou sai & tu nies plus courtois que autres ta prouece est poure & nue & eslongie de tous biens ne ne porroies bien desirier. certes se toute courtoisie fust ore morte & perdue le deusses tu faire reuenir par la haute cheualerie qui est en toi. or ten va atant & te souuiegne des ore mais des paroles que iou tai dites.

Quant il sont andui descendu tristran qui tous est esbahis de cou quil uoit & ot que palamedes remue son harnois de sour son cheual. & le met sour celui de palamedes. & quant il est apareillies de monter. il dist a palamedes. palamedes se diex me saut or saches bien que iou te uoloie grant mal na pas encore granment de tans. mais tant ai ueu a cestui point de tes oeures & de ton fait que tu me fais tout le mautalent oublier que iou aiuoie a toi. ensi comme iou porroie mon ami merciier dune bonte te merchi iou. & me part a tant de toi a court uois a ceste grande feste que li rois artus doit tenir. tuit li cheualier du monde iuerront che ma on conte por ce uois iou la por regarder & pour ueoir les merueilles qui la seront. car iou croi bien que sans merueilles ne sera mie ceste court. tristran ce dist palamedes. quant nos soumes au departir itant fai por ma proiere quant le [*fol. 144, col. a*] roi artu uerras salue le trop de ma part & bien li di que se iou ne fuisse trop a besoignies de grant afaire iou ne laissaisse en nule maniere que iou a ceste feste ne uenisse. mais iou sui tant en besoingnies de grant afaire que iou ne puis aler iusques la. & de sour tous les cheualiers qui la vienent me salue mon seignour lancelot du lac le meilleur cheualier & le plus courtois & le plus sage & le plus

debonaire & le miex parlant que iou sache orendroit en trestout le monde. & li di que palamedes est tous siens en toutes iceles manieres quil sauroit commander & mon seignor Gaheriet le neueu au roi artu & frere mon seignour Gauaines noublies mie que uous ne me salues trop. cil est si preudom comme tu ses poi en a de meillours el monde. onques en cheualier errant ne trouuai meillour conpaignon. que iou ai troue ades en lui. preudom est cortois & sages destrange maniere & hardis bien le sachies & pour cou le me saluerois uous & li dirois que ou que palamedes soit il est tos siens bien le sache.

Quant il ot ensi parle il se departent atant palamedes sen uait dautre part & tristran sen uait le grant chemin ausi con se foudres le cacast. onques celui iour ne cesse de poindre ne desperouner. que uous diroie iou tant ceuauce en tel maniere au plus hastieuement quil puet quil onques ne reposa de iour ne de nuit & ceuauche tant de iournee en iournee quil vint mout pres de la cite de kamaalot. mais atant laisse ore li contes a parler de mon signour tristran & retourne sour vne autre matiere.[1]

En ceste partie dist li contes que il auint que tous li mieudres cheualiers li plus sages [*fol. 144, col. b*] & li plus courtois de tous autres cheualiers cest mesire lancelot du lac vint par auenture sour le pont de corbenic il le passa maintenant & quant il vint en la maistre rue si commenchierent li vn & li autre a crier a lancelot. sire cheualiers la chartre uous atent & il dist basset que sil entre en la chartre ce nest mie la premiere fois. lors ceuauche toutesuois tant quil est uenus a la maistre tour si la prise mont lancelot. car cest la plus biele de son grant quil onques mais ueist. & il escoute & ot crier vne damoisele asses pres de lui il point cele part & uoit que cest la damoisele que me sire Gauaine uaut ieter hors de la cuue. mais il ne pot. & cele damoisele commencha a crier. haꝰ diex qui me getera de chi. quant ele uoit lancelot. si li dist haꝰ sire cheualiers ietes moi de ceste cuue ou il a euwe qui toute mart. & lancelot uint a la cuue & prent la damoisele par les mains & len trait fors. quant ele se vit deliure si li chiet as pies & li baise le iambe & li dist. sirc beneoite soit leure que uous fustes nes vous maues ietee de la plus grant dolour. ou nule feme fust onques mais.

Tout maintenant commencha la sale a enplir de dames & de cheualiers. si sasamblent tout cil du castiel pour ueoir la merueille. il uestent la damoisele & le metent en vne cambre & puis le mainent en vne capiele pour rendre graces a nostre seignour ihesu crist. puis mainent lancelot en vu chimentiere qui deiouste la capiele estoit & li moustrent vne tombe mont biele & mout rice & auoit sus lettres escrites qui disoient. ia ceste tombe ne sera leuee deuant chou que li lyupars dont li grans lyons isust i metra la main. mais chil la leuera legierement & sera engenrres li

[1] Miniature no. 13. "Ensi comme lancelot trait vne damoisele hors dune cuue."

grans lions en la biele fille au roi de la terre foraine. quant lancelot a les lettres leues il nentent mie bien que eles voelent dire & cil qui entour lui sont li dient bien. sire nous quidons bien que che soies uous dont ces lettres par*olent car* nous sauons bien par la damoisele que uous a*ues deliuree que uous estes li mieudres cheualier del monde & seignor fait lancelot que uoles uous que iou face iou sui tous pres que iou face uos uolentes. nous uolons font il que uous leues ceste tombe & uses quil (y a dessoubs) & il met la main al plus gros chief & la lieue mout legierement*

Lors vit laiens le plus hideus serpent & le plus felon le plus cruel dont il eust onques oi[1] [*col. c*] parler. & quant il uoit lancelot. il li iete fu & flambe si ardant quil li brulle tout son hauberch & ses armes si se lance hors de la fosse & commence a ieter fu & flambe parmi le chimentiere si durement que li arbrissiel qui el chimentiere estoient commencierent a ardoir pour lardour del fu. & chil qui laiens estoient monterent as fenestres de la tor pour ueoir comment il en sera. lors ietent a lancelot son escu & son glaiue & il le prent & lors met son escu deuant son uis. & se met maintenant deuant le serpent comme cil qui ne doute auenture qui li puist auenir.

Li serpens li commence aieter fu enuenime qui li art son escu par defors. & lancelot le fiert si de son glaiue parmi le cors quil li enbat parmi le cors & fier & fust & cil commenche abatre la terre de ses eles comme chil qui naures estoit amort. & lancelot met main a lespee & li done itel coup que il en fait la teste uoler. lors virrent chil auant qui ia estoient arme pour lui aidier. & quant il uoient quil est ochis cascuns encommenche afaire mout grant ioie & en commencent tout maintenant les clokes a souner. lors commencent auenir cheualier & dames & damoiseles tant que cou nest se merueille non. il li dient tout maintenant que bien soit il uenus si len mainent el maistre palais si le desarment. atant uirrent issir dune chambre .i. cheualier & od lui grant compaignie de cheualiers & cestoit .i. des plus loiaus homes que lancelot eust mais ueu puis que il parti de camaalot & moult bien sambloit gentiex hom. & quant cil qui laiens estoient le uoient si se drecent encontre lui. & dient ueeschi le roi. lors se dreca lancelot encontre lui si li dist tout maintenant que bien soit il uenus. & cil li rent son salu & li iete les bras au col si li dist sire mout uous desirroie aueoir. or vous auons tant desire dieu merchi que nous vous auons. & nous en auons moult grant mestier. car longement a este nostre pais gastes & desiers & ont li preudome perdus lor gaaignages si iert bien drois des ore mais que lor pertes lor soient restorees & lor bien dont il ont este grant pieche[2] soufraiteus

[1] The bottom of fol. 144 recto, col. b, being almost effaced by time and wear, the portion set in italics is mostly guesswork.

[2] MS "piecha."

Lors sasient li .i. de les lautre & demanda li uns a lautre de son estre & tant que li rois li demanda comment il auoit non. & il dist lancelot du lac. or me dites fait il. li preudom qui mourut de doeuil que on apiela le roi ban ne fu il uostre peres. oil fait lancelot. dont sui iou tous seurs fait li preudom que [*col. d*] par vous ou par ce que de uous istera sera cis pais deliures des auentures qui iauienent iour & nuit.

Lors vint auant vne dame de moult grant eage si apiela le roi si li dist maintenant. sire iou uoeil parler a uous. li rois se part tout maintenant de lancelot & commanda a ses cheualiers quil li fachent compaignie. & il dient que si feront il mout uolentiers. lors sen uait li rois en vne chambre auoec la dame. & quant il fu assis si li dist la uielle. sire que porrons nous faire de cest cheualier que diex nous a chi amene. iou ne sai fait li rois que ien doiue faire fors quil auera ma fille afaire sa volente. enondieu fait la vielle iou sai bien quil ne la prendra mie quant on li offerra. car il aime tant la roine genieure que il ne uauroit en nule maniere autre auoir. & pour cou couuient il que iou le face si sagement que il ne sen apercoiue. ore en esploities fait li rois con vous uolres. mais il couuient que ce soit tost or ne vous en entremetes onques fait la roine car ie enuerrai mout bien achief. lors entra li rois maintenant el palais si sen vint seoir iouste lancelot por lui faire compaignie si parolent li vns al autre & sentracointent au plus bielement que il porent.

Lors demande lancelot au roi comment il auoit non. & il dist quil auoit non pelles de la tere foraine si com il parloient ensi si se regarde lancelot. & vit laiens entrer parmi vne fenestre le coulon que me sire Gauaine auoit ueu autre fois si portoit en son bec .i. encensier dor mont riche. & si tost comme il fu laiens entres si fu tous li palais raemplis de toutes boines odours du monde. lors se taisent par laiens quil ni ot celui qui desist mot ains se ienoillent quant il uoient le coulon uenir. lors entra en vne cambre. & maintenant saillent .ii. seriant[1] qui metent les tables par les dois si sasieent li un & li autre sauf cheque nus ne deist mot ne nus ni parloit de cesti cose si sen esmerueille mont lancelot. si fait autel comme li autre & sasiet deuant le roi & uoit quil sont tout en proieres & en orisons.

Apres che ne demora gaires quil virrent dune cambre issir la damoisele qui me sire Gauaine auoit tant esgardee. si fu si biele & si auenant que lancelot dist quil onques mais si biele ne uit se che ne fu la roine genieure. & dist que uoirement li disoit uoir cele qui laiens lauoit amene. il regarda .i. uaisiel que la damoisele tenoit entre ses mains qui estoit li plus rices qui onques mais fust ueus par home mortel a son ensient. & fais estoit en samblance de [*fol. 145, col. a*] galice. & si li est auis que che soit sainte cose & digne. lors commenca les mains atendre contre lui & aplourer piteusement. si com la damoisele passoit parmi les dois cascuns saienoille deuant le saint uaissiel. & maintenant furent les tables

[1] MS "serant."

raemplies de tous les biaus mangiers que on peust deuiser & li palais enpli maintenant de si boines odours que il sambloit que toutes les espesses du monde ifuiissent espandues.

Quant la damoisele fu alee par les dois si sen torne tout maintenant en la chambre dont ele estoit issue. & quant ele sen fu alee li rois pelles dist a lancelot. si mait diex iou auoie moult grant paor que la grace de dieu ne fausist endroit uous si comme ele fist auant ier a mon seignour Gauain quant il fu chaiens. biaus sire fait lancelot. il nest mie mestiers que nostre sire soit tous iors courechies a ses pecheors. quant il orent mangiet tout par loisir il osterent les napes. & li rois demand a[1] lancelot quil li sambloit du rice uaisiel que la damoisele aporta & de la damoisele. il me semble que si bele damoisele ne ui iou onques mais. mais de dame ne di ie mie.

Quant li rois oi ceste parole il dist maintenant a soi meesme que cestoit uoirs que ou li auoit dit. lors uint a brisane le maistresse sa fille celui qui deuant lot aparle de lancelot. si li dist ce que lancelot li ot dit[2] de sa fille. sire fait ele ie le disoie bien. ore arestes chi vn poi & iou irai a lui parler. & cele vint a lancelot. & li commence maintenant a demander nouuieles du roi & il dist tout maintenant quil nen set nules & ele dist que du roi ne sauoit ele nules noueles. de la roine fait ele ne di iou mie. car il na gaires que iou la vi moult lie & moultioieuse & il tresaut tout maintenant & li demande ou ele la vit. sire fait ele chi pres a .ii. lieues ou ele girra anuit. dame fait il vous me gabes. simait diex fait ele que non fai. & pur cou uous mencrees miex uenes auoec moi ie le uous mousterrai. certes dame fait il uolentiers.

Lors enuoia querre ses armes & cele uint entrementes au roi qui latendoit en sa chambre & li demanda comment il auoit esploitiet. faites tost fait ele uo fille monter & lenuoies au plus procain castiel que vous aues de chi. puis le faites couchier el plus rice lit que on li porroit faire. & ie li ferai entendant que chou est la roine genieure. & ie li donrai encore .i. itel boire que iou ne dout mieque il ne face ma uolente puis que il li sera montes el ceruel ensi poera auenir che que nous uolons. li rois la fist monter puis li bailla .xv. cheualiers qui li feront com[*col. b*]paignie iusquel castiel de la quasse. & quant il ivirrent si estoit ia la nuit oscure. cil qui la damoisele auoient amenee fisent faire .i. lit. & la fisent couchier au plus richement quil porent. & lancelot a prises ses armes & monta sour son cheual & se part de corbenic & ilaissa celi qui li auoit amene si cheuaucent tant entre lui & brisane quil virrent au castel de la quasse. quant il i furent uenu il estoit mout tart ne la lune nestoit mie encore leuee. & brisane len maine en .i. castiel qui estoit mout biaus. quant il fu descendus il entra en vne chambre ou li cheualier estoient. & quant il le uoient uenir il se lieuent encontre lui & li dient que bien soit il uenus si

[1] MS "deman a." [2] MS "dist."

le desarment laiens amout grant ioie & a mout grant clarte. car bien iauoit iusca .xx. chiergres alumes. & brisane si a avne pucele dit ce que ele uoloit faire & li ot baillie les puisons & li dist. quant tu orras que iou demanderai aboiure si en aporte a lancelot plaine demie coupe ne nule autre ne li doine tant comme il en voille boiure & ele dist que si fera ele mout uolentiers.

Quant lancelot fu desarmes il ot talent de boiure a che quil ot eu chaut au uenir si demanda maintenant ou estoit sa dame la roine. sire en cele chambre ou ele est ia endormie au mien ensiant. & il demande le vin & le damoisele a qui on le commanda li aporte le boire tel que nus ne uit meillour & auoit coulour de vin. la coupe estoit bien grande si fu ele pres que plaine. il auoit grant talent de boiure & la damoisele li dist beues car ia ne vous fera se bien non. & si quit que onques mais itel ne beustes. il la boit maintenant tout 'hors & troeue la poison douce & amoureuse si en demande encore autant & cele len aporta & il la boit toute. lors est plus enuoisies que deuant si demande nouuieles de sa dame la roine. & cele lesgarde & uoit quil est ia tous mues. car il ne set mie comment il li est ne comment il vint en la maison ains quide que il soit en la cite de camaaloth si li est auis uraiement quil parauta sa dame la roine qui toudis estoit auoec lui puis que la dame de maloant fu morte. & quant ele le uoit si asote que il porra legierement estre deceus si li dist. sire ma dame la roine puet ia estre endormie que demores uous tant que vous nales parler alui.

Dame fait il pour chou quele ne me mande mie ni uoeil iou mie aler mais se ele me [*col. c*] mandoit iou iroie a lui. enon dieu fait ele uous en ires alui sil uous plaist car uous en orres par tans nouuieles. lors entra en la chambre & fait samblant quele aut parler a la roine. puis vint a lancelot & li dist. sire ma dame vous atent & uous mande que uous viegnies parler a li. & il se fait maintenant descauchier puis entra en la chambre en chemise & en braies si uint au lit & se coucha auoec la damoisele. & cele qui ne desiroit autant rien comme lui a auoir de cui terriene cheualerie est enluminee le recoit lie & ioieuse & li fist autel feste con la roine li faisoit.

Ensi sont mis ensamble li mieudres cheualiers & li plus biax qui adont fust auoec la plus biele damoisele qui adont fust si se desirent par diuerses entensions. ele ne le fait mie tant seulement pour la biaute de lui ne pour luxure ains le fait ele & si ami pour le fruit recheuoir dont tous li biens deuoit uenir el pais que par le coup de lespee as estranges renges auoit este ferus si en auoit este gastes. & essillies. si con li contes du saint graal deuise. & cil la desiroit en autre maniere pour sa biaute nel couuoitoit il mie. mais il quidoit que che fust sa dame la roine. & par che fu il si escaufes quil la counut ausi con adans nos premiers peres fist euain sa moillier mais ne mie en tel maniere. car adans connut

sa feme loiaument & par le commandement de nostre seignour. & cist counut ceste en peciet & en adultere contre sainte eglise & ne pourquant chil en qui toute bontes & toute pities habite & qui ne iuge mie son droit selonc les mesfais as peceours ne selonc les mesfais & le peril aceuls du pais comme cil qui ne uoloit mie quil finissent tous iours en peril ne en escil. si lor dona tel fruit a engenrer & a conceuoir par le flour de uirginite qui illeuc fu corrumpue & uiolee fu illeuc conceue vne autre fleurs de qui bien & de qui doucour maintes teres furent peries & rasasiies. car si com lestoire del saint graal uous raconte de ceste flor perdue fu restores Galaad li uirgenes cil qui les auentures du saint graal mist afin & sasist el siege perilleus de la table reonde v onques cheualiers ne sasist qui ne mourust & tout ausi comme li nons de galaad deuoit estre perdus en lancelot. par escaufement de luxure tout ensi fu recouures en cestui par abstinence de char car il fu uirgenes en volente & en oeures iusca [*col. d*] la mort si con li estoires le deuise.

ENsi fu recouuree fleur par fleur. car en sa naisance fu flors de pucelage estrainte & mal mise il fu flours de cheualerie & de perte restoree par le communal assentement & se uirginites en fu empirie bien en fu li mesfais amendes en sa vie por sa virginite que il rendi sa vie & entiere a son sauueour quanti l trespassa de cest sieucle. & por les biens que il fist en sa vie fu li pechies & li conceuemens estains. si se taist ore li contes de lui. & retourne a parler de lancelot qui se iut od la damoisele toute nuit. si li toli le non a coi ele ne pot onques puis recouurer. car son lapieloit au soir pucele a lendemain lapiela on damoisele.

OR dist li contes que quant lancelot uit que li iours aparut il sesueilla mais point ne uit entour lui de clarte car toutes les fenestres de laiens estoient estoupees si que solaus ni pot entrer ne poi ne grant. lors sesmerueilla mout durement ou il estoit. il tasta entor lui & tasta la damoisele & li demande dont ele estoit & il estoit ia remis en son memoire la forche des puisons iert ia faillie des icele heure quil ot coneue la damoisele carneument. & ele li dist tout maintenant. sire iou sui une damoisele qui sui fille au roi de la terre foraine. quant il entent ceste parole il se pourpense comment il auoit este decheus si en est tant dolant que il quide bien issir du sens. lors saut du lit tant courechies que nus plus. si viest sa chemise & ses braies puis se cauche. & quant il fu tous apareillies & armes il vint en la chambre ou il auoit ieu & oeure les fenestres. & quant il uoit cheli par[1] qui il auoit este decheus il en est tans courechies que il quide bien mourir sans confession. lors pense quil sen vengera sans plus atendre. il trait maintenant lespee du fuerre & vint uers la damoisele mout iries & li dist. damoisele uous maues mort si conuient que uous moures autresi. car iou ne uoeil que vous iamais decheues home si com vous maues decheu.

[1] MS "pour."

Lors dreche lancelot lespee contremont & ele qui grant paour ot de mourir li commence a crier merci a iointes mains. & dist ha~ frans cheualiers pour dieu ne mochies mie pour icele pitie que diex ot de la uirgene marie & lors saresta maintenant tous trespenses si la uit la plus biele quil[1] eust onques mais ueue. lors se pense sil locirra ou sil le laira viure & cele li crie toutesuois merchi & sestoit mise toute nue deuant lui a ienous & il esgarde sa [*fol. 146, col. a*] biaute & son uis si la uit tant biele quil en fu tous esbahis. lors met sespee el fuerre & li dist tout maintenant. damoisele iou men irai si uencus & si recreans comme chil qui ne sose de uous uengier car iou seroie trop desloiaus se iou si grant biaute destruisoie comme il a en vous. si uous pri que vous me pardones chou que iou ai traite mespee sour uous. car ire & mautalens le me fist faire. sire fait ele uolentiers par si que vous me pardounes uo mautalent & il li otroie tout maintenant puis que a faire li conuient ensi pardoune li uns alautre son mautalent & sentrebaisent puis se commandent a dieu.

Quant il vint aual il trocue son cheual tout ensele si lauoit fait brisane apareillier pour ce que il le trouast tout prest quant il reuenroit aual. car ele sauoit bien quil ne remanroit mie laiens. ains senpartiroit si tost comme il saperceuroit de la deceuanche. quant il fu montes il prent son escu & son glaiue quil trouua a vn arbre apoiet si senua dolans & courechies. il entra en son chemin mout pensis. & li rois pelles se fu matin leues & fu uenus au castiel de la quasse pour ueoir sa fille. car ou li auoit bien dit comment lancelot sen estoit ales. quant il uint la il la trouua moult durement malade pour la paour que lancelot li auoit faite si conta a son pere comment il li estoit auenu quant li rois sot lestre de lui & de lanchelot il le fist garder moult soigneusement & plus la fist honorer que deuant. si ne demora mie granment que il sot bien que ele estoit enchainte par uisitiens[2] qui li disent & par la pucele meesme qui li dist que cou estoit uoirs si enfurent si liet que nus plus & chil du pais en fisent trop grant ioie. mais atant laist ore li contes a parler du roi pelles & de sa fille & de lancelot. & retourne a parler de boort de gaunes & de Galaad.

Or dist li contes que quant che auint que Galaad ot pres dun an si auint que mesire bohors de Gaunes vint .i. mardi au soir al castiel de corbenic & quant il vint alentree du pont si trouua desous .i. arbre .i. cheualier arme de toutes armes qui li dist de si loing comme il le peut oir. sire cheualiers se uous estes de la maison le roi artu si retournes car parchi ne passeres vous mie. por coi ni passeroie iou fait cil bohors. pour che fait il que iou le uous desfent. & nus qui de lostel [*col. b*] le roi artu soit ni passera tant com iou i soie neni passa plus a de demi an. & pour coi fait bohors ne uoles uous que nus qui soit de cel ostel i past. pour chou fait il que iou les he tous pour .i. cheualier

[1] "quil" is repeated. [2] MS "uisitieus."

qui irepaire & a non lancelot du lac. comment fait boors haes uous donc lancelot du lac. oil fait il plus que nul home del monde. dont ne porries uous estre acordes a moi fait bohors. car celui que uous haes tant aim iou plus que nul home del monde car il est me sires & mes cousins germains. or uous gardes dont de moi fait chil iou uous desfi & uous asseur que pour lamour de lui mourres ains que uous mescapes.

Lors laissent courre li uns alautre & sentrefierent grans cous es aleures des cheuaus si durement que il font les glaiues uoler en pieces & sentrehurtent descors & des escus si durement quil ni a celui qui ne soit estroues & il sont ambedoi mout estoune. li cheualiers uole a terre par desus la crupe du cheual tous debrisies & bors hen passe outre tout a cheual si esbahis quil ne set que faire. mais il reuint tost en sa forche & en son pooir & prise moult le cheualier a qui il auoit iouste car mout est de grant force. li cheuliers fu releues moult honteus de cou quil ot ensi este abatuss it raist lespee & dist a boort qui encore estoit a ceual que est che cheualiers ies tu dont si couars que tu noses descendre ains masauras a cheual & iou sui a pie. certes se tu mochioies en tel maniere li cheuaus en aroit le pris ne mie tu. dans cheualiers fait boors naies paour de chou si mait diex iou ne vous asaurai mie a cheual tant com vous soies a pie. car iou iaroie plus honte que honor. il descent erranment de son cheual & la tache a vn arbre qui estoit au chief dun pont puis trait lespee & en brace lescu & sen irait uers celui qui point ne laime.

Lors commencent a issir hors du chastiel cheualier & dames & damoiseles pour ueoir la bataille & cil orent les espees traites si sentredounent grans cols la ou il sentrepeuent ataindre si depechent les escus & les hiaumes & desmaillent les haubers sor les bras & sour les espaules. mais boors gete vns cols si pesans que chil na armes qui toutes ne depechent deuant lespee & tant a boors mene le cheualier quil ne le puet mais soufrir en nule maniere car trop a perdu du sanc. & si se desfent il de tout son pooir car bien quide mourir sans merchi auoir. [*col. c*] mais tant sest conbatus que plus ne se puet desfendre si le maine boors si comme il vieut vne heure auant & autre arriere & chil guenchist quan quil puet qui moult doute lespee. car en plus de .x. lieus la sentue iuscal sanc. mais toutesuois boors le coite durement car il ne le uaura mie laissier atant & cil recule iuscal pont. car il a tant perdu du sanc quil a grant paour de mourir & pert le sens & le memore & la force & a tant recule que apoi quil nest cheus en liaue.

Quant boors qui moult lauoit trouue preu & hardi uoit quil est en peril de mort si en a moult grant pitie & pense que si preudom comme il est ne mourra ia de ses mains se dieu plaist. car trop seroit grans damages & il estoit sour le bort du pont & pres de cheoir en liauwe quant boors le uoit il li escrie maintenant retourne cheualiers ou tu cherras en liaue. & chil regarde & uoit que cest grant merueille que il ne

est piecha cheus. lors connoist la deboinairete & la frankise de boort & set quil nen eust mie tant fait sil[1] fust en sen point. il dist tout maintenant a boort ha˘ frans cheualiers ne mochies mie mais laissies me viure par si que iou me mete del tout en uostre merchi a faire quanque vous uolres & uees chi mespee que iou uous rent. & bors la prent tout maintenant. & quant chil du castiel uoient que la bataille est finee il sen uont el castiel & maintenant ua bohors uers le cheualier & li demande comment il a a non. sire fait il on mapiele brunor du plaissie. or me dites biau sire por coi haes uous lancelot du lac. en non dieu fait il ce uous dirai iou uolentiers.

Il est uoirs que chaiens a la plus biele damoisele[2] du monde que iam & ai amee pour sa biaute si auint que iou li dis[3] plus a de demi an que iou lamoie & li proiai que ele me dounast samor & ele me dist tout maintenant que non feroit. car ele amoit si comme ele me dist .i. cheualier qui asses mieudres cheualiers estoit de moi & plus uaillans. & me dist que cou estoit me sire lancelot du lac & ie li dis tout maintenant que lancelot nauoit onques este mieudres cheualiers de moi & bien li mousterroie. car iamais ne fineroie deuant chou que iou auroie trouue lancelot. & quant trouue lauroie. iou me conbatroie a lui & sil me conqueroit par armes iamais ne requerroie samour. & se iou le conqueroie iou uauroie samour auoir & ele me dist que si aueroie ie

Quant ele mot fait tel promesse iou me parti du castiel moult lies si men aloie a la court le [*col. d*] roi artu ou ie quidoie trouer lancelot. & se iou leusse troue la me fuisse ie combatus a lui. mais chil de laiens me disent quil ne lauoient ueu plus a de demi an. & quant iou oi che iou men ving cha & enpris a garder cest pont en tel maniere que pour cou que iou ne lauoie trouue dis iou que iou me conbatroie tous iours mais a tous chiaus de la maison le roi artu & por lui haoie iou tous les autres si uous est ore si avenu que diex vous a done pooir sor moi de moi conquerre. ia soit ce que onques mais ne trouuai home qui me menast a outranche. or vous ai iou conte pour coi ie haoie lancelot. si est en vous del parfiner ou del ochirre. mais pour ce que ie me tieng pour outre & que en ma mort ne porries rien gaaignier voeil iou que vous me pardones le mesfait de ce que iou me sui a vous combatus. volentiers fait boors mais il conuient que vous soies au ior de pentecouste a la court le roi artu si uous rendes a lancelot du lac de par boort de Gaunes son cousin & vous metes en sa merci a faire son commandement. & il li fianche ausi a faire si remonta boors sour son cheual & a ceulli sa voie parmi le pont & parmi la maistre rue de corbenic.

Quant il vint droitement ala maistre porte si descendî tout maintenant deuant le palais qui auoit autrefois ueu. & uallet saillent maintenant qui li dient bien uiegnies & il lor rent lor[4] salu si prent li vns son escu &

[1] MS "fil." [2] MS "damoise." [3] MS has "dist." [4] MS "son."

li autre le mainent el palais lors li vienent alencontre cheualier dames & damoiseles. qui li demandent qui il est & il dist quil est[1] de la maison le roi artu. & a anon boors de gaunes. & quant chil de laiens loent il dient que bien soit il uenus si li font mout grant ioie & portent par laiens nouieles de lui & dist li uns alautre ueeschi le cousin de mon seignor lancelot qui chaiens est uenus. apres che ne demoura gaires que li rois pelles issi dune chambre & fu mout ricement uestus de cote & de mantel de samit. si amena od lui mout grant compaignie de cheualiers & boors le connut tantost comme il le uit car autre fois lauoit ueu si li vint a lencontre si li dist. sire bien viegnies. biaus sire fait li rois diex vous doinst boine auenture lors sasieent andoi sour vne kieute pointe de cendal. si commencha li vns a parler a lautre. tant que li rois li demanda comment il lauoit fait puis. & il dist bien dieu merchi. car iou sui tous sains & tous haities graces dieu. & li rois li demande par amors or me dites & que fait lancelot. il a mout lonc tans que iou ne la vi & par lamor de lui ai iou enuoiet a court. certes sire fait boors. lancelot est tous sains & tous haities. [*fol. 147, col. a*] dieu merchi. si na mie encore. viii. iours que iou le ui a .i. tournoiement quil uenqui deuant le castiel del pingue v il ot des meillours cheualiers del monde & tant ia demoure quil ne uint a court ne ne nous vint veoir plus a de demi an & a este en la prison morgain la fee lonc tans si comme il me dist. si se departi auant ier de moi mais il sera le iour de pentecouste a court se diex li done vie.

Puis quil est sains & haities fait li rois moi nencaut de sa demouree. mais diex ensoit adures quil est hors de prison. si mait diex fait li rois toute rien en doit auoir ioie. car au mien ensiant cest li mieudres cheualiers du monde. pleust adieu quil fust ore chi & fust ausi sains & ausi haities comme uous estes. si mait diex iou en seroie plus lies que qui me donroit . cent. mars dor. si comme il parloient issi[2] dune chambre la fille au roi pelles si ricement atournee que che fu merueille de sa vesteure. & ele estoit mout bele damoisele si quil nauoit plus biele el monde. si auint tantost con chil de laiens la virrent uenir il se lieuent contre lui. & ele ne fu mie esbahie ains sala tantost seoir de les bohort & li dist que bien fust il uenus & il li rent son salu au plus biel quil puet. & ele sasiet les lui comme cele qui mout le desiroit aueoir. si parlerent moult entraus .ii. dunes coses & dautres. si comme il parloient ensi il virrent venir vn cheualier mout viel qui portoit vn petit enfant en son geron qui estoit de mout petit eage & nauoit mie encore .i. an ains sen failli .ii. mois & li enfes estoit tant biaus durement que estoit merueille & estoit enuolepes de dras de soie. si le moustra li cheualiers a boort. & li dist. sire cest uostre petit parent nel ueistes uous onques mais. sachies quil est estrais del plus haut lignage qui soit en crestiente & est uos cousins de che soies tous chertains.

[1] Not in MS.

[2] MS "issi ischi dune."

Quant boors uoit lenfant il li est auis que il uoie lancelot & sans faille il le resambloit si bien comme figure dome pooit resambler autre. si demanda boors tout maintenant qui il estoit. or me dites fait li cheualiers counissies uous nule ame en uostre lignage qui il resamble. or lauises bien & iou mesmerueillerai moult se vous ne le recounissies tantost. & boors le regarde si nen ose mie dire son penser. car bien li est auis quil resambloie lancelot mais pour che que [*col. b*] il set la uerite de lui & de la roine nen ose il mie dire son pense. ne pour chou pour che que il li couuient respondre a chou que li cheualiers demande dist. si mait diex fait il. il me samble que il resamble miex lancelot que nul autre home. en non dieu fait li preudom il le doit bien resambler . car il issi de lui tout vraiement le sacies.

Quant boors ot chou il en est moult lies. si demande tout maintenant comment il auoit non & li preudom li dist quil auoit non galaad. & quant boors loi. il en ot moult grant ioie. & maintenant le prist entre ses bras & le commenche a regarder & a baisier & a plourer de ioie & de pitie moult tenrement. si dist al enfant biaus dous sire bien soies vous uenus & buer fuissies uous nes. car vous seres encore pilers & estendars de tout nostre lignage & beneois soit diex qui chi ma amene car iou ne fuisse mie si lies se iou eusse conquis par armes le meillour cheualier du monde. entrementres quil parloient ensi entra laiens li coulons qui portoit en son bec .i. encensier dor & entra en la cambre ou il entroit acoustumeement maintenant fu li palais enplis de toutes les boines ondeurs du monde. lors misent maintenant les tables & les napes. & puis sasient au mangier sauf che que nus qui fu laiens ni fu apieles. si nauoit laiens home qui mot desist. ains estoient tout enproieres & en orisons aussi bien li viel comme li iouene.

Apres che ne demoura gaires que de la chambre issi la damoisele qui entre ses mains portoit le saint graal. & si tost comme ele entra en la sale si sagenoillent en contre lui tout chil de laiens & disoient tuit basset beneois soit diex qui de sa grase nous raenplist. ensi comme la damoisele passoit parmi les dois si sen rentra maintenant en la chambre dont ele estoit issue. maintenant commenchierent a parler parmi le palais des auentures del saint graal. & quant il orent mangie si furent maintenant les napes ostees. si sala li rois pelles apoiier a vne fenestre iouste boort si commenchierent entrex a parler dunes coses & dautres tant que boors demanda au roi la uerite de lenfant. si li conta li rois comment il estoit auenu & comment lancelot fu deceus par coi il connut la damoisele si com hom doit connoistre sa feme. car onques mais de nul engien [*col. c*] nauint ausi bien comme il auint de cestui. car sans faille de nostre lignage & du uostre doit issir li urais cheualiers par qui les auentures du saint graal seront menees a fin. & uous di uraiement quil serra ou siege pereilleus de la table reonde & iou uous di uraiement

se chou nest chil enfes iou ne sai qui che sera. car de tous les cheualiers du monde est ses peres li mieudres cheualiers. certes boort fait li rois iou sai bien que che sera chis enfes car li prophete & li hermite de cest pais lont afferme par verite.

Sire fait boors cis palais ou nous somes a non li palais auentureus. enondieu fait li rois uous dites uoir . car vous iaues ia ueues bieles auentures puis que vous iuenistes nest che mie merueilleuse auenture quant li sains graaus uous raemplist de viandes. certes fait boors uoirement est chou mout biele auenture. si mait diex puis que iou i sui uenus iou ne men partirai deuant chou que iouiau rai geu une nuit. si verrai les merueilleuses auentures que me sire Gauaine uit quant il i iut. ha sire pour dieu fait li rois nel dites iamais . car par la foi que iou doi dieu uous ni girres mie a nuit. car iou quit bien que vous nen escaperies ia sans honte ou sans damage. & iou ne vauroie pour la moitie de ma tere que maus vous auenist dont iou vous peusse garder car iou enseroie blasmes de maintes gens. sire fait boors quant iou ving primes iou nen apris rien si que puis enfui blasmes de maintes gens en tel lieu ving iou puis. pour che vous di iou que iamais a nul iour de ma vie de cest ostel ne partirai deuant che que iou ensarai plus que iou nen sai ore endroit. me dites vous uoir fait li rois. oil uoir fait il. enondieu fait li rois de cest serrement uous destournerai iou au mains anuit. mais demain enfaites quanquil vous plaira puis quensi le uoles faire. & demain souferrai iou bien que vous iremaignies atele heure que diex vous enlaist partir sans honte. & pour coi fait boors ne soufres uous mie que iou i remaingne huimais. soufres vous fait li rois iou le vous dirai ains que vous partes de chaiens. la nuit iut boors en vne chambre qui estoit desous la tour si li fist li rois tant donor comme il pot faire

Au matin vint li rois a boort si li dist. biaus amis il est ensi que uos deues anuit gesir el palais auentureus. sire fait il vous dites voir [*col. d*] or vous pri iou fait li rois que vous ales parler a .i. de nos capelains si vous feres confes auant que vous aillies deuant le saint graal. car puis que vous seres nes & espurgies de tous visces iou ne quit mie que il vous meschie tant que se vous venies deuant lui vies & ort. quant boors oi che si cret maintenant chel conseil & le tint aboin & a loial. si tost comme il ot oie messe issi hors du moustier & apiela .i. des capelains de laiens si se fist confes de tous ses pechies dont il se sentoit coupables uers dieu si li conta tout maintenant son estre conques .i. seul mot ne len cela. si la trouua chil de si boine vie que il sen esmerueilla. & bien uit quil nauoit onques pechie fors en vne seule feme che fu la fille au roi brangoire de cele auoit il eu alain le blanc.

Quant boors fu confessez de cuer & de bouche. il rechut maintenant corpus domini car il nestoit mie bien asseur pour les auentures qui auienent el palais quant il ot che fait il issi hors du moustier ioians &

lies ne onques ne uaut mangier dautre viande que la sainte ouulee quil auoit vsee. au soir remest el palais tous seus & li autre sen departirent tuit. si le laissierent illeuc. au soir quant il fu anuitiet que li iours fu oscurchis pour la uenue de la nuit sala seoir el lit qui estoit el chief del palais. & si tost comme il fu asis commencha laiens la plus grant noise del monde. car .i. uens i leua si grans que cou estoit une merueille car tout maintenant. commenchierent les fenestres de laiens a flatir les vnes encontre les autres. si estoit uraiement auis a celui qui les ooit que li palais doiue fondre del dehoisement que les fenestres faisoient. & quant tout che fu remes si issi de la chambre vne lanche qui estoit grande & longhe dont li fers flamboioit comme vns chierges enbrases si senvint vers boort ausi comme vns effoudres si li feri si durement que parmi lespaule senestre li enbati bien plaine paume enparfont. et quant il se sent ensi naure il en est tous esbahis car il ne uoit mie celui qui la lanche tenoit dont il auoit este ferus. & nepourquant il sent que on li oste mais il ne set qui. & quant il fu desferres si senrala la lance en la chambre dont ele estoit uenue. & il remaint el lit si malades comme chil qui bien quide mourir. mais il ne se remue del lit ains ibee aremanoir toute la nuit comme chil qui ne li caut li auiegne.

Lors ne demora gaires que il uit issir dune chambre .i. cheualier mout ricement arme de toutes armes [*fol. 148, col. a*] si fu moult grans de cors & moult furnis. & la ou il uit boort il li dist sire cheualiers leues uous de cel lit si uous ales reposer en autre lieu. car chi ne poes uous mie longement demourer. & il dist quil ne se mouueroit pour lui ne pour autre. enondieu fait li cheualiers se vous faites tant que io ume combate a uous uous ni gaaigneres nient. car auous me conuerra combatre se uous ne uous mouues. & boorsd ist quil ne lenchaut. enondieu dist li cheualiers or soies dont tout asseur que tant com iou puise tenir mespee uous ne seres en repos.

Quant boors uoit quil est uenus a la mellee il se drece en estant. & nepourquant il estoit si durement naures que uns autres hom en mourust sil fust ensi naures comme il estoit. mais il estoit si preus & si hardis quil aime miex a mourir a honor que a honte uiure lors trait maintenant lespee & court sus au cheualier & li done si grant coup parmi le hiaume & chil qui estoit de grant forche se desfent moult vigereusement. mais tout fust boors naures si estoit il fors & uistes & isniaus si le maine en tel maniere a cel premier asaut si durement que chil nel pot soufrir en nule maniere. ains uait tant guencissant comme qui tant sauoit de mal quil vint en la chambre ou li sains graaus estoit & si tost comme il en reuint hors si fu il ausi haities comme il estoit deuant. & ot maintenant recouure forche & alaine. car sil ot este las & traueillies il est ore endroit mout haligres. si recourt sus a boort si vistement que boors en est tous esbahis. si dist a soi meesme iou uoi

merueilles de cest cheualier car iou disoie maintenant quil estoit uencus ne quil ne se pooit mais aidier. & puis quil entra en la chambre a si grant forche recouuree que iou quit quil nen ait mie mains quil auoit deuant au commencemènt de la bataille iou croi quil soit uenus de dieu ou del diable. Ensi dist boors celeement & li cheualiers li vint lespee drechie contremont si li done mout grant coup la ou il le peut ataindre. & boors se desfent bien & biel comme chil qui ne puet mie legierement estre greues par lesfors dun cheualier sil ne fust moult preus si fait tant par sa forche & par sa legierete que il vint audeseure de la bataille. si vous di chertainement que quant il dut entrer en la chambre ou li sains graals estoit que boors li vint audeuant si li dist. sire cheualiers chaiens nenterres uous huimais. lors lahiert au hiaume & li esrache de la teste. lors li saut sour le cors & li abat la uentaille. si li dist quil loccirra [*col. b*] tout maintenant sil ne se rent ou sil ne se tient pour outre ou sil ne li fianche a tenir prison ou il uaura. lors hauce lespee & fait samblant quil li uoeille la teste couper. & on ueoit laiens moult cler. car toutes les fenestres de laiens estoient ouuertes si que la lune i luisoit & li cheualiers uoit tout maintenant lespee si set bien quil est en peril de mort sil ne se tient pour outre. si crie merchi acelui qui conquis lauoit. & boors li dist iou ne sai qui uous estes car onques mais ne vous vi a mon ensiant. si couuient que vous me fianchies com loiaus cheualiers que vous le iour de la pentecouste seres a la court le roi artu . ou que il le tiengne. a cel iour iseront tout li preudome del monde au mien ensiant. & chil li otroie maintenant. car bien uoit que faire lesteut. iou te dirai fait boors que tu feras. tu te rendras a lui de par boort de gaunes & chil li creante. lors prent maintenant son escu & son glaiue & sen reuait maintenant la dont il estoit issus & boors sen reua seoir ou lit. si comme il se fu assis lors commencha abescochier de cascune fenestre ou saiete ou quarriaus qui commenchierent a ferir sour lui si quil sen sent feru quen son escu quen son hauberch enplus de cent lieus dont il fu mout durement naures & nepourquant il ne se remue ains se tint ausi fermement & ausi seurement con sil neust nul mal si atent en tel maniere les auentures de laiens. car il pense bien quil en i auenra encore.

Quant li quarriel orent laissie auenir tout maintenant reclosent les fenestres si fisent tel noise au reclorre comme se tous li pauemens dust cheir adont rot laiens[1] mout grant clarte. quant li palais fu racoisies si issi dune chambre de laiens vns lyons qui vint uers boort les menus saus la geule baee. & quant boors le uoit uenir il saut sus tout maintenant si prent son escu & le tourne deuant lui. si hauce lespee pour lui ferir parmi la teste. & chil iete maintenant les dens & les ongles encontre comme chil qui se uoloit desfendre si ataint lescu boors par desous si enporta tout deuant lui ausi comme vn pan de samit. si senfailli mout petit quil nabati boort. mais boors se tint bien comme chil

[1] Repeated in MS.

qui asses auoit pooir & forche puis le fiert mout durement parmi les oreilles si quil li coupa tot en trauers si quil chei mors seur le pauement. puis se rasiet el lit si se repose apres che ne demoura [*col. c, verso*] gaires que il uit issir dune chambre qui estoit el palais le serpent que me sire Gauaine ot ueu si estoit si grans & si espeuentables que nus ne le ueist qui grant paour nen eust. car il nestoit nule si diuerse colours que on ne peust sour lui trouuer. si auoit les iex ausi rouges comme feu & ausi enbrases comme se che fuissent estoiles & quant il fu issus de la chambre el palais il commencha á aler parmi le palais le petit pas ietant feu & flambe. mais che nestoit mie granment & uous di quil saloit iuant a sa keue ausi comme uns enfes. & boors uit lettres en son front escrites au rai de la lune qui laiens entroit qui disoient que cestoit la senefianche du roi artu.

Quant li serpens fu uenus en mi le palais si vit boors uenir encontre lui. i. lupart grant & merueillex mais il ne se puet aperceuoir dont il est issus. si court tout maintenant sus au serpent qui getoit fu & flambe & font entraus .ii. si grant bataille que cest merueilles aueoir. si se desfent si bien li lupars que il uait ades tere conquerant sour le serpent. boors regarde mout longement cele bataille si sesmerueilla moult durement que che pooit estre. car il uoit entraus si grant cruaute conques mais si grant cruaute ne uit entre. ii. bestes si pensa tout maintenant que chou estoit aucune senefianche. & quant la bataille a tant dure que li .i. ne li autres ne pot plus soufrir si se traist arriere li serpens & li lupars sesuanuist en tel maniere que boors ne set quil est deuenus. & si tost con li serpens uint alentree de la chambre ou li sains graaus estoit si le commencha amostrer ausi comme beste qui a angoisse de faouner quant ele est en grant destrece.

Tout ensi se demena li serpens une grant pieche & puis commencha a ieter de sa bouce serpentiaus iusqua cent. si vous di que tantost que li serpentel furent hors que il uoloient lor mere mangier. mais ele se desfendi bien. si dura tant la bataille contre aus que li serpentel furent tout ochis & li grans serpens mors. de ceste cose sesmerueilla moult boors plus que de nule rien que il ueist. car il set bien que cest aucune senefianche mais il ne puet mie sauoir bien que chest. lors uit boors issir dune cham-[*col. d*]bre un home qui estoit pales & maigres & miex sambloit mors que uis. cil auoit a son col pendu .ii. culeuures trop poignans. si disoit sire diex ou fourfis iou onques a auoir la grant dolour que iai & que iou seufre. haz doux diex uerra iamais cil qui de ceste maleurte me doit oster. ensi se dementoit chil & se clamoit caitif maleureus si portoit deuant lui vne harpe mout riche. car il iauoit tant dor & de pierres precieuses que cestoit merueilles aueir.

Quant li hom uint enmi la sale il sasist en vne chaiere dor qui estoit en mi le palais & par ior & par nuit. il prist son peletron & com-

menche a ateniprer sa harpe au miex que il pot si commenche anoter .i. lai si notoit & plouroit mout durement. si notoit vn lai de ioseph dabarimacie ensi comme il vint en bertaigne quant nostre sire le fist ariuer a son uoloir. boors imet mout durement son auis. si entent que cest la desputison dorfeu lencanteor & de ioseph dabarimachie qui fonda le castel en la mer descoche. quant il ot son lai fine il se drecha en estant. & dist a boort. sire cheualiers pour noient estes demoures en cest castiel & en cest palais. car bien sachies chertainement que les auentures de chaiens ne remanront[1] par vous ne par autre deuant che que li boins cheualiers ivenra qui les auentures du saint graal metra a fin. chil achieuera toutes les auentures que uous aues anuit ueues. & si me deliuerra de ceste paine ou iou sui. si vous di que vous vous en porres aler quant il vous plaira car vous ni feres plus que vous iaues fait. or me dites fait boors comment soufres vous ces culeuures entour uostre col qui tel mal vous font si comme il mest auis. enondieu fait cil asoufrir le me couuient. en tel maniere prent diex veniance des grans orgieus que iou fis iadis. & se iou en estoie quites par ceste paine terriene iou men tenroie a bien paiies & a boin eure. car tant ai fait de maus en ma vie que a paines porroie iou adieu acorder si uoeil que vous sachies que bien ai deseruie ceste paine que iou seusfre

Atant sen parti li hom sans plus dire si li uoloit encore boors demander plusours choses. mais chil entra en sa chambre comme chil qui nauoit congiet de plus demourer. ains entra en la chambre dont il estoit issus. adont ne demora gaires que parmi la verine entra li blans coulons qui en son bec portoit lencensier dor. si entra [*fol. 149, col. a*] en la chambre dont li greaus estoit issus la nuit deuant. maintenant fu li palais cois & seris & raemplis de toutes les boines odours du monde. & il flairoit ausi souef com se toutes les epesses del monde i fuissent espandues.

Maintenant issirent dune chambre enfant qui estoient tant biel quil sambloient mie quil fuissent enfant terrien mais esperituel si portoient .iiii. candeilles en .iiii. candelers & apres eus aloit .i. hom vieus anchiens & tous kenus qui portoit en sa main vn enchensier. si estoit vestus comme prestres sauf che quil nauoit point de casure afulee. & portoit en vne de ses mains vne lanche & quant boors le vit il sen esmerueilla mout durement. car il vit ke du fer de la lanche chaoient goutes de sanc qui degoutoient lune apres lautre aual le fust. mais il ne set que eles deuienent & boors pense que che soit sainte cose & digne si sagenoille en contre & lencline. & chil qui la portoit uint droitement a la chaiiere si sasist de dens puis dist a boort. sire vous estes li plus purs & li plus nes qui onques mais entrast chaiens de la maison le roi artu si porres dire quant uous uenres en uo pais que vous aues ueue la lanche uengeresse si ne saues que cest ne ne sares deuant chou que li sieges de la table reonde que on apiele perillex ara trouue son lieu & son maistre.

[1] ? "remueront."

mais par celui qui si asserra sares uous la uerite de ceste lance. & qui la porta en cest pais & dont ele vint. & ne pourquant se lancelot se fust ausi bien gardes comme uous estes des le commencement. il meist tot afin dont uous estes ore en paine. car il est tant boins cheualiers que nus plus. car il na son per el monde. mais il est dautres uises si enpiries que toutes les boines uertus qui estoient en lui sont mortes par foeblece des rains.

Lors sen uait chil atout la lance quil auoit aportee & sen entre en la maistre chambre si ne demoura gaires que il uit en la sale iusqua .xii. damoiseles qui mout estoient pourement uestues & apareillies. car iou uous di certainement que lor garniment ne ualoient se petit non si uenoient tout bielement lune apres lautre & ne disoient mot. mais eles plouroient si durement quil nest nus cuers sil loist qui pitie nen eust. si vont tant queles vienent al huis de la cambre. si sarestent illeuc & saienoillent illeuc. & font [*col. b*] trop grant doeul. & toutes uois parmi le grant doeul queles faisoient disoient eles proieres & orisons & il nen set que dire. car de toutes coses que auenues li sont nen set il la senefianche si le saroit il mout uolentiers a celes qui les lui sont sil ne quidoit que maus nen auenist. & si dist il quil nen iroit mie ensi quil nen sace aucunes nouuieles sestre puet en nule maniere

Lors vint boors a vne des damoiseles & li dist. damoisele se diex uous consaut dites moi de uostre estre & pour coi vous plores ensi. has sire fait la damoisele laissies nous en pais. si nous laissies faire le seruice que nous auons enpris car de nostre estre ne sares uous ne tant ne quant. a tant les laisse boors en pais si sala seoir el lit. & les damoiseles ne demeurent plus. ains sen uont. quant che vint .i. poi deuant la mie nuit lor auint boors deuant la chambre ou il auoit si grante clarte. quil sanloit que li solaus i eust son habitacle si crut tous iors & amenda plus & plus. lors uaut dedens entrer mais il uit vne espee clere & luisant apareillie de lui ferir sil aloit plus auant. & il retourne maintenant. car bien uoit que ceste auenture est de par dieu. mais toutesuois esgarda il tant en la chambre que il i vit vne table dargent qui estoit sour .iiii. fuisiaus mais li fuisiel estoient tant biel & tant riche comme chil qui tout estoient couuert dor. mais encore estoit cascuns plus merueilleus si con lescripture du saint graal le deuise. & deuisera quant lieus & tans en sera. sour la table dargent estoit li greaus couuert dun samit blanc. & deuant la table auoit .i. viel home reuestu en guise deuesque. & quant il ot demore vne grant pieche. il se drecha en estant & vint maintenant au saint vaissiel. a dont i ot si grant clarte que de plus grant noi onques mais hom parler

A cel point que li preudom osta le samit de sour le saint graal si sespandi par laiens si grant clartes quil fu auis a boort que en mi *le*[1] uis & es iex le fert uns rais du soleil si en deuint esperdus *quil*[1] en

[1] Guesswork.

perdi toute la nuit sa veue. si quil ne vit goute. lors oi boors vne uois qui li dist boort ne vien plus auant pour coi fait [*fol. 149, col. c, verso*] il. pour cou fait la uois que tu nies mie dignes de ueoir plus des secres de chaiens. & se tu ies tant hardis que tu sour ceste desfense viegnes auant tu nen escaperas sans perdre la force de tes menbres si comme daler & de ueir & seras tous iours ausi comme vne pieche de fust & ce sera trop grans damages car mout es[1] preus & hardis.

Quant boors entent ceste nouele il en ot moult grant paour car bien quide que che soit uoirs si sen retourne arriere si sen uait uers le lit ou il auoit sis mais il ne uoit goute ne pour quant se sent il sain & haitie fors de la plaie quil auoit eue de la lanche. si commenca tout maintenant aquerre le lit aual & amont. en tel maniere fu boors laiens iusqual ior si fu mout durement esmaies car il quidoit bien auoir perdue la ueue a tous iours mais si uous di que se me sire Gauaine oi grant ioie & grant melodie qui i fu. encore i ot ore plus grant. mais toute la nuit fu ensi que onques ne but ne ne manga si fu mout espoentes que nostre sires ne fust courechies alui. si uous di que al aiourner il ot mout grant ioie a son cuer. maintenant entra laiens li rois pelles & sa biele fille auoec lui. & quant il troeuent boort sain & haitie si en fisent mout grant ioie. & li rois li dist si mait diex nous auons anuit este moult a malaise pour uous si en parolent en tel maniere a lui & li dient que onques mais nus ni fu qui sen peust passer sans honte auoir & uous en est miex auenu quil en auenist onques mais a nul home si nous en est font il mout biel.

Cel iour demoura laiens boors que onques pour cose que il deist ne len laissierent partir ne pour cose que il peust faire si li fisent moult grant ioie. car mout estoient liet de lauenture que diex lor auoit dounee. si li demanda li rois. sire pour dieu ueistes vous mon pere. si mait diex fait il iou nel counois point. sire fait il chou est li rois mehaignies que on apiele le roi pesceour le meillour cheualier & le plus hardi qui onques fust a son tans. & comment fu che fait boors quil fu mehaignies. enondieu fait li rois che fu pour loutrage que il fist. quant il traist lespee du fuerre qui nen deuoit mie estre ostee deuant che que li cheualiers len osteroit qui merroit[2] afin les auen-[*fol. 149, col. d, verso*] tures du saint graal. & pour ce quil le traist sour le desfens que mis iestoit li fu lespee ferue parmi les quisses si quil en fu mehaignies si quil nara iamais garison deuant chou que li boins cheualiers iuenra qui de son sanc len ondera ses plaies. sire fait boors iou ne le vi pas. mais por dieu de la lanche que iou ui me dites nouieles car mout me vient agrant merueille. car iou ui goutes de sanc qui en issirent & cest une cose que mout uolentiers uauroie sauoir sestre pooit. si mait diex boort fait li rois il nest mie raisons que la uerite de la lance uous sois dite ne a vous ne a autrui. mais quant la queste du saint graal sera enprise[3] que tout li boin che-

[1] MS "est." [2] ? "menroit" or "metroit." [3] MS "enprrse."

ualier du monde se traueilleront adont ensera la uerite descouuerte a vous & a autres de che que vous demandes ne deuant lors nen sares uous la uerite. & il dist quil sen souferra atant puis quil uoit que afaire li couuient. Tout le iour demora boors laiens & la nuit ausi & alendemain bien matin se parti de laiens tous armes & tous apareillies si se mist sour son cheual & vous di quil ceuaucha tant par ses iornees que il vint a camaalot. mais dauenture qui li auenist puis quil se parti de corbenic ne parole mie li contes ains le ramaine acourt le iour de pentecouste.

Or dist li contes que li rois artus estoit uenus de conquerre le roi claudas de la deserte ensi con lestoire de lancelot raconte & quant il fu uenus a camaalot il fist sauoir atous chiaus qui en la grant bertaingne estoient qui de lui tenoient tere quil tenroit au iour de pentecoste court a camaalot la plus grant & la plus enforcie que il tenist mais piecha. & il lor manda quil ne laissaissent en nule maniere que il ne uenissent au plus hounorablement que il porroient. ceste nouuiele courut mout tost & fu seue partout & en escoche & en yrlande & en toutes les illes de mer qui pres estoient de la grant bertaingne. si sappareillent cheualier & dames & damoiseles pour aconplir le commandement le roi & pour uenir a la feste qui grande sera che quident il bien

Tant est alee la nouele & pres & loing quil en oirent parler en la court le roi pelles & que sa fille de qui lancelot auoit engenre galaad & que encore lamoit tant que feme pooit plus amer home le sot. si demanda congiet a son pere quil le laissast aler acele feste & a cele court qui tant seroit biele & iolie si comme ele auoit oi dire. & il li otroia mout uolentiers [*fol. 150, col. a*] quant ele ot lotroi de son pere ele prist od lui brisane sa maistresse & dames & damoiseles & escuiers iusqua .xl. si sesmuet pour aler a camaalot & en mena auoec lui galaad qui mout estoit biaus enfes de son eage si le porta .i. escuiers deuant lui sour vn palefroi fort & isnel & bien portant.

En tel maniere erra la damoisele tant que ele uint a heure de miedi la uegile de la pentecouste a camaalot & descendi en la court aual entre lui & sa compaignie. & on li fist mout grant ioie & moult grant feste. & boors lamena amont par la main qui moult grant ioie li fist. & quant chil de laiens virrent le grant biaute de lui si disent & asfermerent quil nauoient onques mais ueue si biele feme comme ele estoit. la roine li fist toute lounor que ele pot pour chou que tant estoit biele & estraite de haut lignage si li laisse vne partie de sa chambre pour metre de ses coses vne partie. quant lancelot la vit tant biele il dist a soi meesme que uoirement eust il fait trop grant desloiaute sil eust occhise si biele dame comme ele estoit si se repent moult del samblant que il en fist quil ne lose regarder. & cele qui tant lamoit quele ne pot rien tant amer le regarde mout uolentiers & moult se delite en lui ueoir & moult se

plaint en son cuer de cou quil ne lesgarde ausi uolentiers comme ele fait lui. & ele ne se coile mie a sa maistresse. ains li dist. moult fis que fole que iou mis mon cuer en amer si haut home comme est me sire lancelot du lac. car il ne me daigne regarder. ne uous esmaies mie fait brisane que se diux me consaut ains que nous departons de ceste court le metrai iou en uostre saisine que ia cose ne uaudres auoir de lui que uous naiies.

La feste est commenchie la vigille de la pentecoste grande & merueilleuse & encore uaut ele mix asses pour la damoisele que li rois tenoit atant bele que il ne uit onques mais si bele rien ce dist il bien & ausi font tout li autre. si se painent mout de lui seruir li poure & li rice. mais sour tout lonorement le seruoient li .iii. cousin boors ly oniax & hector & che faisoient il pour lamor de lancelot. dont il sauoient bien lafaire qui auoit este entre lui & la damoisele. ne il nesgardoient rien si uolentiers comme il faisoient lor petit cousin lenfant con apieloit Galaad. au mardi soir auint que la roine dist a lancelot que ele lenuoieroit querre par vne damoisele au premier somme. & il dist quil venroit tantost [*fol. 150, col. b*] quil orroit le mesage comme cil qui mout amoit sa dame la roine.

Brisane qui mout se metoit en grant agait de deceuoir lancelot oi ceste parole si nen set que quidier fors tant que ele pense bien que il doiue aler a sa dame la roine. brisane fu mout lie de ceste parole si le dist a la damoisele & li creanta que ele li amenroit anuit lancelot a son lit asseur en puet estre. & ele li dist que ce li plaisoit mout. car moult amoit lancelot de grant amour. au soir quant il furent tuit couchie par laiens brisane qui mout auoit grant doutanche que la damoisele la roine ne souspresist lancelot que ele uenist anchois au lit que ele. si se lieue & sen uait au lit ou lancelot gisoit comme cele qui bien le sauoit & li dist tout bielement sire ma dame vous atent hastes vous. damoisele fait il iou uois. or sus fait ele. & il saut sus en braies & en chemises. & ele le prent par le main si lenmaine droit au lit a la damoisele. & chil se couche de les lui & cele le rechoit a grant ioie & il li fait autel soulas & autel ioie comme il auoit a coustume a faire a sa dame la roine. car il quidoit uraiement que che fust ele. en tel ioie & en tel deduit sendorment cil dune part & cele dautre & se tint cascuns a boin eure. cil de sa dame que il quide tenir. & cele del home del monde que ele plus aime. si ne pensent mie granment ala dame qui se gisoit & languissoit en son lit pour son ami lancelot que ele atendoit. quant ele a grant piece atendu & ele uit quil demouroit tant si sen esmerueilla mout que che puet estre. car ele ne li commanda onques mais rien que il ne li fesist. lors apiele sa cousine qui tant ot este en la prison de gaunes & bien sauoit lafaire de lui & de lancelot. se li dist que ele sen uoist au lit lancelot & len amaint auoec lui. & ele li dist que che fera ele moult uolentiers si sen vient au lit ou lancelot auoit la nuit couchie si tasta amont & aual mais ele ne le pot

mie trouuer car il ni estoit mie. quant ele ot grant piece mis a lui querre si sen reuint a sa dame si li conte quele ne la mie troue

Quant la roine entent ceste parole si nen set que dire fors tant que ele quide que il soi tales a chambre si atent vne piece & puis ireuait la damoisele ueoir si nen troua mie. puis sen retourne & sen vint a sa dame la roine & li conte & ele fu tant dolante que nule plus. la chambre ou la roine gisoit [*fol. 150, col. c, verso*] estoit moult grans si que la fille au roi pelles igisoit dune part entre lui & ses damoiseles & la roine gisoit dautre part. & cele nuit auoit la roine ostees ses damoiseles dentour lui pour chou que eles ne sapercussent de la uenue lancelot. che fu apres mienuit que lancelot se commencha a plaindre tout endormant si comme il auient par maintes fois que gens se plaignent en dormant. & la roine qui ne dormoit mie loi tot maintenant si le recounoist au plaint que il ieta si sot maintenant que il estoit auoec la fille le roi pelles dont ele fu mout dolante & en fist tel cose dont ele se repenti puis. & ele nauoit mie apris que lancelot se courechast. si fu tant dolante de ceste auenture quil nest nus hom qui dire le uous peust.

Maintenant se lieue la roine en estant & se commenche a estoussir & tantost sesuelle lancelot & quant il ot sa dame la roine si loing de lui. & il sent celui si pres de lui. il saperchoit tantost quil est decheus. lors uest sa chemise & sen vint ala roine mais la roine qui se fu cauchie pour lui prendre laiert au poing & counoist la main que ele ot maintes fois tenue. & lors li dist tant dolante que ele samble quele doiue du sens issir. lerres traitres maluais qui en ma chambre deuant moi aues fait ore ribaudise fuies de chi & gardes que iamais ne viegnies en lieu ou ie soie. dame fait il pour dieu aies merchi de moi. car il nest mie si con uos quidies. si mait diex fait la roine che na mestier mais ales vous ent.

Quant lancelot ot cest commandement il nose mot dire. ains sen uait tout ensi comme il estoit sans armeure & vient uers la court aual & sen uait uers le iarding le roi & entre dedens & sen uait toute la uoie tant que il vint as murs de la chite & se mist hors par vne fenestre. quant il est hors issus il esgarde la vile de camaalot & li souuint de sa dame que il laisse. & des grans ioies & des grans deduis que il a eues par maintes fois & ore len conuerra soufrir & mal traire par maintes fois desore mais & paine & traual. lors ueissies home dolant & courecie & faire mout grant doeul. il esrache ses cheueus qui tant estoient biel. & il esgratine son uis si que li sans en saut de toutes pars. quant il est tex atournes quil a tout le viaire sanglant. il com-[*fol. 150, col. d, verso*]menche a maudire ceste auenture qui tant li est crueuse & felenesse. car iusqual iour dui a il este li plus eureus cheualiers del monde. or li conuerra vser le remanant de sa vie en plours & en larmes et en toutes maleurtes. ensi se dolouse & tourmente iusqual point du iour. quant il vit que li iours vint il dist si dolans quil ne set que il puest faire ha. camaalot boine

chites & bien garnie de cheualerie & bien garnie de dames. quant iou quidai mieus uiure ai pris entoi mort a cest commencement. car iou sui uenus au doeul dont iou mourrai. a cest mot se fiert en la forest plourant a caudes larmes & criant mors haste toi de uenir a moi car iou sui de uiure tous anuiies

Entel maniere erra lancelot par la forest .iii. iors & .iii. nuis sans boire & sans mangier es plus sauuages lieus que il sauoit comme chil qui ne uoloit mie estre conneus ne encontres par home qui larestast .x. iors erra en tel maniere faisant tel doeul que merueille estoit comment il duroit. si fist tant dedens i chel terme que il fu hors du sens si quil ne sauoit quil faisoit si erra en tel maniere .i. mois tout entier quil nencontra home ne feme a qui il ne se presist. si fist maint anui a maintes gens dedens cel terme. car sil encontrast dame ne damoisele ele ne se partesist de lui se li eust il fait anuy si fu grant merueille que il ne fu mors par tele auenture. mais atant laist ore li contes a parler de lui & retourne au roi artu & a ceus qui a camaalot estoient remes.[1]

Or dist li contes que quant lancelot se fu parti des chambres la roine. ou il ot este soupris auoec la fille le roi pelles qui bien sauoit quil sestoit partis adoeul & a perdition se diex ni metoit consel. lors dist a la roine hay dame mal aues esploitie qui aues enchacie de court le plus uaillant home del monde. si mait diex uous enrepentires encore. damoisele fait la roine tout ce maues uous fait & pourchachie. or sachies se ie en puis uenir en lieu en tel maniere le uous guer-[*fol. 151, col. a*]redonerai con uous aues deserui. mar fuissies vous onques si bele. car uostre biaute comperront[2] encore maint preudome & lancelot meesmement dont cest mout grant damages. si poes bien dire que par ceste cose sera encore ceste corsen doeul & en tristreche qui a ceste pentecoste a este tant lie. car si tost comme il ne porront trouer celui qui de chi se part il commencheront pour lui vne queste la plus grant qui onques fust. quant la damoisele ot chou si ne set que dire de ceste cose car bien quide que la roine die uoir. lors commencha a plourer mout durement. & en ce quele faisoit cest doeul se uest & apareille & pleure tous iours & maine grant doel de cou que ele a fait. & pense que mais a pieche ne le uerra. si en est tant dolante que nule plus car ele lamoit sour tous homes.

Al matin quant il fu aiourne se leua la damoisele & sesueilla toute sa maisnie & lor dist apareillies uos harnois car maintenant men irai. si tost con iou aurai parle au roi & il li disent que tout estoit prest. & ele uint tout maintenant au roi si le salua & li demanda congiet car ele sen ueut aler en son pais si comme ele dist. & li prie mout doucement de remanoir mais ele ne li ueut pas otroier. & quant il uoit que ele ne remanroit mie il monta tout maintenant a grant compaignie de cheualiers

[1] Miniature No. 14. "Ensi comme lancelot sen part dune chambre en braies & en chemise tous nus.

[2] ? "Coromperront."

auoech lui & la conuoia. uiscala forest de camaalot. puis retourna li rois si la commanda adieu & ele lui. lors apiela la damoisele boort & li dist que ele uoloit a lui parler. lors se traient a vne part loins des autres si li conta maintenant comment il estoit auenu de lancelot & comment la roine les auoit pris ensamble & li conta comment la roine li auoit doune congiet & comment il sen estoit partis en chemise & en braies sans autre uesteure si vous pri fait ele que vous le queres. car sil na conseil prochainement ou par vous ou par autrui il porra cheir enteil maladie dont il ne sera mie legierement garis. si sera trop grans damages. car il est boins cheualiers.

Quant boors ot cele parole il ne fu mie aaise. car trop amoit lancelot. se li dist. damoisele puis quil est ensi que il uous en couuient aler iou uous commant adieu. & sachies que iou enterrai tout maintenant en queste de mon seignor lancelot. ne iamais ne finerai deuant cheque iou larai trouue. atant se departent li uns de lautre si sen uait la damoisele en son pais dolante & courechie de ceste auenture qui auenue [*fol. 151, col. b*] li estoit. & boors qui estoit remes a camaalot uint a la roine & li dist. dame pour coi uous aues vous ensi trais. que mon seignor qui estoit li plus preudom du monde & tant vous amoit aues si uilainement cachie de court. si mait diex maint mal en seront encore fait & puis que uous ne quidies car ore endroit uerres commenchier vne queste qui iamais a nul iour du monde ne sera finee & dont maint preudome mourront qui ne laront pas deserui. si poes dire que nos lignages est plus abaissies par uous quil ne sera iamais amontes.

Cele qui tant est courecie que nule plus li respont. boort si mait diex uoirement ai ie honi le plus preudome del monde si en sui tant dolante que iou uauroie estre fondue en abisme si uous en cri merchi si fesisse iou lui sil fust chi. car iou uoeil bien que uous sachies quil na home el monde que iou aime autretant com iou fais lui. & pour ce fui ie tant dolante quant iou le trouuai auoec la damoisele car tele en fui atournee que bien enquit issir del sens. dame fait boors iou croi que il nest mie loing de chi & pour chou irai iou pour mes armes & le querrai tant loing & pres que iou le trouerai se iou puis & qui ira od vous. enondieu hestor des mares ivenra & lyoniaus mes freres. or uous maint diex fait la roine en tel lieu ou uous le puissies trouer. car iamais ne serai lie deuant che quil sera trouues. lors vint boors a hector & a lyonel & lor dist seignour prendes uos armes & venes auoec moi en cele forest ou iai vn poi a faire. quant il oient chou il li demandent sil a grant besoing. iou le vous dirai mout bien. fait boors quant nous serons hors de chaiens. mais faites che que iou uous di. & chil virrent a lor osteus puis se font maintenant armer puis murent & sen issent de laiens sans escuier & sans serians[1] & quant il furent uenu as chaus si lor dist boors.

[1] MS "serrans."

Biau seignour fait boors saues uous pour coi iou uous ai chi amenes nenil fait cascuns & il lor conte maintenant lauenture de lancelot & comment la roine lauoit soupris auoec la fille au roi pelles dont ele ot si grant doeul quele en quida bien du sens issir & il sen ala en braies & en chemise. si ai moult grant peur que il ne senuoist en teil lieu que il ne reviegne [*fol. 151, col. c, verso*] mais a pieche. & iou vous ai fait armer pour lui querre ains que il soit trop eslongies.

De ceste cose sont cil tant amalaise que apaines le uous porroit nus conter comme cil qui mout doutent les mescheances qui auienent si dient que chi a maluaise auenture & quil doiuent mout hair & maudire leure que il acointa la roine parfoi fait lyoniaus se ele li dona congiet vn poi estoutement. il laime tant forment que iou ai grant paour que il ne sochie & pour chou ne sai iou que dire de ceste cose fors que nous pensons de lui querre au miex que nous porrons & il si accordent tuit. & boors lor dist biau seignour puis que nous ne sauons comment il nous auenra en ceste queste ou del demourer ou del reuenir vous di iou que nous soions tout au iour saint iohan au castiel maran qui est pres de chi ala fin de ceste forest lors dira cascuns chou quil ara trouue. & il si acordent tuit si se departent li uns de lautre & uont demandant lancelot par bours & par chites parmi religions & parmi hermitages. si cerkent tous les lieus ou il quident que cheualier doiuent repairier. mais il ne vienent en lieu ou il puissent oir noueles de lancelot. ains dient tuit que il nen seuent rien si pesa mout a maintes gens de ceste auenture dolereuse qui auenue lor estoit. entel maniere errerent li .iii. cousin ius qual iour de le saint iehan que li uns nencontra lautre & sentremanderent comment il lauoient puis fait si trouerent que entreus tous nen auoient riens apris si enfurent moult courechie car mout auoient grant paour que il ne fust ochis ou cheus en aucune maladie

Entrementres que il parloient ensi & prendoient conseil de ceste cose. si seregardent & uoient uenir vn cheualier arme & vne damoisele & .ii. escuiers & trespassoient parmi le castiel si comme auenture les menoit. & boors vint au cheualier & li prie que il li die quel part il deuoit aler seignor fait il aceus qui li demandoient iou uauroie ore estre a la court le roi artu. car estre mi couuerra au plus tost que iou poerai. hasire fait boors puis que uous ales a court faites moi vn seruice qui mout petit uous coustera & saues uous quels il sera. uous dirois au roi que uous trouuastes compaignons qui quierent lancelot du lac. & ont mout grant paour que il ne soit perdus & que pour lui somes entre en ceste queste & en a-[*fol. 151, col. d, verso*]uons mout grant paour car nous nen poons oir nouuieles. si prions au roi que il le fache querre par toute sa terre sauoir sil porroit trouuer qui nouuieles len aportast. & se li rois uous demande qui chou li mande si li dites boors de gaunes & lyoniaus

ses freres & hestor des mares ses cousins & il dist que che fera il bien si se partent atant li uns de lautre. mais au departir li demanda boors comment il auoit non. & il dist quil auoit non melians du tertre.

Lors ceuauche tant quil vint au roi artu ou il ne trouua mie mout de gent. li rois artus estoit asses courechies pour les .iiii. cousins qui si sont perdu quil nen set ne uent ne uoie. quant melians fu uenus deuant le roi il li dist che que boors li auoit mande lors ueissies le roi courechie & plain dire si dist que ci auoit trop grant damage. mais me sire Gauaine a cui il en pesoit plus que a tous ceus de la table reonde demanda maintenant ses armes si dist erranment que se diex li aidast iamais ne reuenroit a court deuant che quil aroit trouue les .iii. cousins. qui lancelot uont querrant. & tout entel maniere fait[1] me sire ywains. & dist quil li feroit compaignie. & ensi dist saigremors & agloual & gaheriet & mordes & tant des autres quil furent bien iusqua .xiii. si sesmurent tout ensamble puis se partirent de la court & errerent tant amont & aual quil trouuerent les. iii. cousins qui lancelot aloient querant & lors fu la queste recommenchie qui en tout lan ne fu laissie. ains dura tout cel an & lautre apres si la tint li vns plus que li autres. mais pour cou quil ne trouuerent lancelot sen taist ore li contes aparler deus & retorne a parler dagloual.

H. Oskar Sommer

Astolat, Camberley,
Surrey, England

[1] "fait" not in MS.

OLD FRENCH INFLUENCE ON MIDDLE ENGLISH PHRASEOLOGY

I

The inherent interest in the growth of the English language during the mediaeval period seems, in the light of the following brief researches, to justify a further criticism of a dissertation by Mr. F. H. Sykes, entitled *French Elements in Middle English* (Oxford, 1899).[1]

Mr. Sykes defines thus the purpose of his investigation:

> This dissertation aims to show that Middle-English became in its phrasal forms "halb-französisch;" that its phrasal power is indeed pre-eminently Romance in character. . . . . The object of the present study is to show how, to what extent, and at what time the English language schooled itself to new phrasal expressions, which were often without equivalents in Anglo-Saxon, but which sometimes displaced equivalent Anglo-Saxon expressions; to show how far these phrasal changes proceeded under the influence of the Old French . . . . ; to show the chronological movement of those phrasal changes so as to establish a comparison with the movement of change in the vocabulary; to draw from any ascertained results some conclusions respecting the character and chronology of the formation of standard English.

The "General Conclusions" on page 63 of his dissertation are practically in accord with the purpose of the thesis so definitely set forth at the outset.

[1] The alternative title reads: "Chapters Illustrative of the Origin and Growth of Romance Influence on the Phrasal Power of Standard English in the Formative Period."

Professor W. Franz presented a very convincing review of this essay in the *Literaturblatt für germanische und romanische Philologie*, July, 1900, cols. 241-43. He emphasized strongly the untrustworthiness of elements of this study, and concluded that "Die prinzipielle Frage der Beeinflüssung des Mittelenglischen seitens des Altfranzösichen ist durch die vorliegende Leistung um keinen Schritt gefördert worden." Cf. also W. K. in *Literarisches Centralblatt*, 1901, cols. 688, 689. The notices by Professor A. S. Cook in the *Journal of Germanic Philology*, III, pp. 119, 120, and by Professor J. M. Garnett in the *American Journal of Philology*, XX, 4, p. 443, merely give a statement of contents.

A recent discussion by Professor A. Trampe Bødtker, "Bear and Take in Middle English Phrases" (Christiania, 1905; *Videnskabs-Selskabets Skrifter*, II, Hist.-Filos. Kl., 1905, No. 6), attempts to show that "the phrases pretended to be due to French influence are mainly based on Old English construction." My study, which presents evidence entirely from mediaeval languages, may serve to strengthen his conclusions. It will at least prove more definitely than has yet been done the untrustworthiness of Mr. Sykes's results. I may add here that a study of Old Norse phraseology, which was suggested to me by Professor Robinson, of Harvard University, is responsible for the present discussion, which was completed before the appearance of Professor Bødtker's treatise.

These confident declarations of purpose and of results are emphatic statements in regard to a somewhat obscure problem in the history of the English language between 1200 and 1400. The student of the history of English during this period of change—of decay and of growth—cannot but be skeptical as to the extensive phrasal power over the language which the author credits to the Old French. It is almost incredible that so vigorous a language as the Anglo-Saxon should so yield to an even dominating foreign tongue as to lose the power, which all languages must acquire as they become stronger, of forming such idiomatic expressions as are here brought forward. It is conceivable that in translations from a foreign tongue, or in works modeled closely after those of another language, many idiomatic expressions of one speech should be adopted by another. But that an entire language, used for purposes of communication and for artistic expression, a language of a people vigorous and growing, should, in the matter of one of the most subtle of the phenomena which a language displays, be so vitally affected as to become half-foreign—whether, in the case of English, *halb-französisch* oder *halb-nordisch* oder *halb-deutsch*—is a proposition the possibility of proof of which few students of language-growth would be prepared to admit.

Hence, this dissertation, which seeks to show the overwhelming influence of Old-French on Middle-English phraseology, deserves a careful scrutiny. The first part of the investigation, "Verbal Phrases," may serve not only for a study of some of the evidence in detail, but also for a more general consideration of the larger aspects of the subject, such as the method which the author adopts, his general attitude toward, and the soundness of his judgment in respect to, questions of chronological development, of change in language, and of the influences which were operative especially on the English language during the period under discussion.

The method to which Mr. Sykes adheres in his study seems to be as follows: a careful culling from the dictionaries of all phrases formed with the Middle-English verbs *beren*, *nimen*, and *taken*, likewise of those phrases formed with the Old-French verbs *porter*

and *prendre;* a study of the Middle-English phrases with respect to the uses of the verbs in Anglo-Saxon; and finally a consideration of the chronology of the Middle-English and Old-French phrases respectively. On the data so procured the author bases his conclusions as to the influence which Old French exerted on Middle English in the matter of its phrasal power. It will be evident, as the discussion proceeds, that this method of approach has its serious drawbacks, and that the conclusions at which the author arrives are not only not convincing, but that they are also in part in serious error.

At the outset, attention must be called to the undoubted insufficiency of the evidence which is offered by the dictionaries. A dictionary does not record all the uses of a word or phrase in any one author; neither does it attempt to record every appearance of a certain phrase in a language. Here is an evident limitation to the accurate determination of the forces which have exerted their influence on any language. The student must go to the literature itself; he must be satisfied not only of the mere existence of a phrase in the literature of a certain period, but also of the *extent* and *manner* of its appearance.[1] The kind of literature in which the phrase is found is often of primary importance in determining the history of that phrase. The detailed evidence in phrases which Mr. Sykes presents may rest upon a wide reading of the authors and works cited, but I see no ground for such an assumption. Some trustworthy results may come, as I believe they have come in this dissertation, without a wide reading knowledge of the literature; but no definite proof, as will appear from a study of some phases of the investigation, will be forthcoming until an exhaustive knowledge of Middle-English literature has been acquired or made use of by the inquirer in this field of linguistic history.

But granted for the moment that the evidence so secured from

[1] May not the phrasal significance of a combination of words, moreover, often be determined only by the frequency of its appearance? The individual words may in the mind of a certain author stand by themselves to denote separate conceptions; and the combination may have no special significance as a phrase. If, on the other hand, this group of words occurs frequently in the writings of an author, we may feel reasonably confident that the conception is single, the meaning depending on the phrasal force of the combination of words.

the dictionaries is sufficient, it is by no means safe to rest an argument for the influence of Old French on Middle English on the priority in date of the Old-French literature containing phrases identical with those in Middle English. The student must take into consideration the development of a language within itself—this necessity Mr. Sykes is not unmindful of—and the possibility of influence from more than one other kindred tongue. One language, at least, in view of its known intimate relations with Middle English, cannot be overlooked in an investigation of this sort. I refer to the Old Norse. Mr. Sykes is complacently neglectful of the very close connection between the Old-Norse language and Middle English. Under the discussion of *nimen*, *taken*, he says (p. 13):

> The introduction of Old Norse *taka*, "take, seize, catch, grasp, reach," etc., which constantly won ground on *nimen* during the Middle English period, contributed much to the growth of phrases, but the evidence of the chronology and of the authors here cited shows that in the main we have to reckon with French influence and not Norse in the extension of the phrasal use of *take* during the period of which we treat. The definition of Old Norse phrasal influence is much to be desired.

I fail to see wherein the evidence of the chronology and of the authors cited shows the lack of Old-Norse influence. Mr. Sykes's statement, if it means anything, should be supported by direct proof. Of such he presents none. The truth of the matter seems to be that the author is not endeavoring "to show how, to what extent, and at what time the English language schooled itself to new phrasal expressions;" what he does is to endeavor to show how, to what extent, and at what time the English language schooled itself to *Old-French* verbal expressions.[1] Herein lies the danger, which the author does not avoid, of a mental prejudice in favor of his thesis—a prejudice which causes him to neglect certain obvious facts of literary history, and to disregard the evidence and the aid toward a sound judgment of language-influence and language-changes which he might obtain from a

[1] This method of approach in the study of the relations between Old French and Middle English is not unique with Mr. Sykes. Cf. what Professor Jespersen has to say in regard to the investigations of E. Einenkel.—*Progress in Language* (London, 1894), pp. 171, 172.

study of allied languages and literatures.[1] Obviously, then, the test of chronology which Mr. Sykes applies is not absolute.

It is not surprising that the result of Mr. Sykes's study of Middle-English verbal phrases under such limitations as are incident to his method of investigation, are not entirely convincing. A doubt arises in the mind of the critic as to the safeness with which Mr. Sykes may attribute so much phrasal influence to the Old French. As to how much of its present phrasal power the language would have acquired without any extraneous influence it is probably impossible to say. The history of other languages may doubtless furnish some evidence. But as to the *extent* of the Old-French influence on Middle English, the statement may be made with some degree of certainty that it was not nearly so widespread as the researches of Mr. Sykes would lead the reader to believe. The reasons for this statement will appear in the following section.

II

Certain literary monuments of the Middle-English period which were written in the north of England are generally assumed to lie beyond the pale of French influence. Among these, the most highly finished literary product which has come down to us is undoubtedly the *Ormulum*. Written about 1200 in the seclusion of a cloister by a monk who lived, according to ten Brink, in the northeastern part of the former kingdom of Mercia, the poem is practically free from Romance influence. Even if the opinion of Professor Kluge, that French influence had penetrated to the North by 1200 to a surprising degree,[2] be accepted, it is none the less true that this most important Middle-English monument is almost wholly without signs of intercourse with Romance literature or speech. I say "almost wholly," since Kluge gives a list of 23 words in Orm which he believes to be taken from the French; and furthermore declares that many surnames show French *Lautspuren*. Even with this evidence indicating some French influence, he would be most hardy, indeed, who should

[1] Professor Franz, *op. cit.*, calls attention to the evidence which Mr. Sykes might have secured from the history of the German language. Cf. also W. K., *op. cit.*

[2] "Das französische Element in Orm," *Englische Studien*, XXII, pp. 179–82.

suggest the possibility of any French *phrasal* influence on the *Ormulum*. A few foreign words may creep into an author's language when his knowledge of that foreign tongue is comparatively slight. But the presence in an author's speech of foreign idiomatic expressions such as verbal phrases demonstrates his entire familiarity with this outside language. As such an acquaintance with French in the case of Orm is out of the question, the possibility of any French phrasal influence in the *Ormulum* needs no further discussion.

If Orm was, as we have seen, little affected by the Old French, he was greatly influenced by the Old Norse. It is unnecessary to do more than state this universally admitted fact. What Kluge says about Old-Norse influence in general on Northern Middle English applies equally well to the *Ormulum*.

> Noch in einem besonders bedeutsamen Zuge äussert sich der nordische Einfluss in England; es sind nicht bloss Stoffworte aus dem Skandinavischen entlehnt, sondern auch Formworte, besonders Pronominalworte. Derartiges begegnet wohl nur selten auf andern Sprachgebieten. Wir sehen daran wie intensiv die beiden Elemente sich gemischt haben müssen. Und zwar schon am Schluss der angelsächsischen Zeit.[1]

Brate[2] gives 188 words in Orm taken direct from the Norse or showing strong Norse influence. Kingdon Oliphant[3] says about Orm: "His book is the most thoroughly Danish poem ever written in England that has come down to us."

Now, if in the *Ormulum*, a poem free from French influence, these verbal phrases which Mr. Sykes ascribes to the Old French occur with considerable frequency, we are surely justified in denying the overwhelming French phrasal influence on Middle English. Furthermore, the justification of this denial is strengthened when we find that in Old-Norse literature anterior to or contemporary with Orm there exist in comparative abundance many of the identical phrases found in the *Ormulum* and in other Middle-English literature. And finally, though I do not urge it, the probability of considerable Old-Norse phrasal influence on

[1] *Paul's Grundriss*, I, p. 937, 2d edition.

[2] "Nordische Lehnwörter in Ormulum," *P. und B. B.*, X, pp. 1 ff.

[3] *Old and Middle English*, 2d ed. (London, 1891), p. 180.

Orm[1] demands consideration, especially if we bear in mind the following facts: (1) the marked Old-Norse influence in general on Orm; (2) the Old-Norse literature in which these phrases occur is homiletic, sermonic; (3) much of the literature antedates the *Ormulum*.

Let us consider some of these verbal phrases, which Mr. Sykes attributes to the influence of Old French, with respect to their presence in Orm and the Old Norse respectively.

1. "Bear witness."

Orm:[2]

Ll. 12615–16 Annd I barr to þe leode
Wittness off himm

L. 18268 Whamm þu barr wittness to þe follc[3]

Ll. 18342–43 I barr himm wel wittness

L. 18929 He barr wittness

Cf. ll. 16888–89 Annd tohh swa þehh niss ȝuw nohht off
To takenn ne to trowwenn þatt wittness

Old Norse: *Leifar fornra kristinna froeða islenzkra*[4], Arne Magneian No. 677, 4 to (c. 1180 A. D.):

P. 7, ll. 7–8 Verken bera vitni

P. 98, l. 12 þau ef vitni bera

P. 103, l. 27 oc boro iarteinir vitni heilagleic hans

P. 117, ll. 10–11 Sciotleicr iarteinar sialfr ber vitni

P. 138, l. 28 en þo bera guðspiallr orþ þat vitni

Norsk Homilie-Bog,[5] A. M. 619 (c. 1170 A. D.):

P. 89, l. 32 oc bar vitni hinn sanna

P. 144, l. 18 Dat vitni bar honum sialfr droten Jesus Christ

P. 186, l. 2 Honum bar droten vár þat vitni

Arne Magneian MS No. 645[6] (c. 1200 A. D.):

P. 90, ll. 28–29 øll vitne þau er þeir boro

[1] This looks like an *argumentum ad hominem*. It is to be observed, however, that I do not deny the probability of considerable Old-French phrasal influence on Middle English in general. So the possibility of some Old-Norse influence may be suggested without ascribing to the northern language a preponderating share in the process of verbal phrasal composition in Middle English.

[2] *The Ormulum*, edited by Robert Holt (Oxford, 1878); two volumes.

[3] This phrase Mr. Sykes quotes among the examples of phrases influenced by the Old French. He evidently does not recognize the difficulties involved in an acceptation of such an influence in the *Ormulum*.

[4] Edited by D. Bjarnarson (Copenhagen, 1878).

[5] Edited by Unger (1864).

[6] *Isländska Handskriften No. 645 i den Arnamagnæanska Samlingen*, edited by L. Larsson (Lund, 1885).

None of the other verbal phrases with "bear" are found in Orm. When we come to verbal phrases with "take," we find a great abundance.

1. "Take baptism."

The word "baptism" is not found in the *Ormulum* (an indication probably of the absence of French influence; its presence in other Middle-English literature is, I believe, merely as a *lehnwort*). Orm preserves the Anglo-Saxon *fulluhht*. Yet we find various phrases which have nearly the same meaning as "take baptism," and hence may be offered here as evidence.

Orm:

Ll. 19923–25 Annd forr soþ crist þatt þurrh Drihhtin
To manne cumenn waere
Annd takenn wel wiþþ hiss fulluhht

Cf. also l. 17911 toc þa þaer to fullhtnenn

Ll. 1973 ff. Annd all þatt follc þatt fullhtnedd wass
Att cristes Lerninngcnihhtes
þeȝȝ alle takenn Haliȝ Gast

Cf. further l. 11160 takenn crisstenndom

Ll. 17016, 17457 takeþþ crisstenndom

Old Norse: *Leifar:*

P. 92, l. 27 oc (toc) hann scirn oc var vel cristin alla e̥fi

Homilie-Bog:

P. 84, l. 18 toc fyrstr scurðarskirn

P. 191, l. 8 þu toct við scirn

A. M. No. 645:

P. 46, l. 30 oc toc scirn manne domini

P. 109, l. 4 oc toco marger scirn

Cf. *Homilie-Bog:*

P. 64, ll. 16, 17 ver tocum við cristni

2. "Take flesh, humanity."

Orm:

Ll. 10436–37 Annd tiss daeþshildiȝ mann þatt crist
Toc i þe laffdiȝ Marȝe

L. 18505 Acc he toc flaesh

Old Norse: *Leifar:*

P. 58, l. 24 ef hann toc manlict øðli

P. 82, l. 22 þat er goddomr toc manzlicam

P. 180, l. 3 toc likam þrelz gaerr

P. 188, l. 3 ef þrels licam toc á sic.

Homilie-Bog:

P. 68, ll. 27–28 þa er asnilegr guð toc synilégam manndom á sic.
P. 69, ll. 31–32 at himna konongr tóc á sic iorð licams vars.
P. 72, l. 21 oc tóc mannzlicam á sic.
P. 80, l. 14 þa er hann toc manndom á sic.
P. 119, l. 30 er galauslegr taecr hold oc bloð cristi.
P. 140, l. 24 ac toc manndóm á iordu.
P. 171, l. 18 þo at hann tøke manndom á sic.
P. 119, l. 33 at hann toc hold.

3. "Take death."

Orm:

Introd., l. 9 toc daeþ.
Introd., l. 19 toc daeþ O rodetre.
Introd., l. 84 toc O rode daeþ.
L. 1423 toc daeþ.
Cf. l. 15780 To þolenn daeþ o rodetre.
L. 16268 O rode þolenn daeþ.

Old Norse: A. M. No. 645:

P. 75, l. 17 toc licamligan dauþa á sic.
P. 128, l. 10 Dauþa varn toc hann á sic.

Leifar:

P. 74, l. 28 at sa leusti þa fra sunþom er sunfalauss toc dauþan.
P. 74, l. 30 er licams dauþan toc á sic fur oss.
P. 97, ll. 29–30 þa toc en dauþi ond.
P. 169, l. 28 en prestrin toc braþan dauþa. Cf. p. 88, l. 5 ef hann hafþi *banasott tecna.*
P. 93, l. 8 ef hann toc bana.
P. 125, l. 15 Ef Eumorphius hafþi tekit banasott.
P. 140, l. 6 ef hann toc banasott.
P. 168, l. 24 þa er Cuthbert toc banasott.

Homilie-Bog:

Cf. p. 145, l. 22 oc toco bana.

4. "Take example."

Orm preserves Anglo-Saxon *bisen* and likewise Anglo-Saxon *niman.*

Orm:

L. 2114 Takeþþ bisne.
L. 4834 takenn bisne.
L. 14586 þu takesst bisne.
L. 14470 Annd ȝiff þu bisne takenn willt.

L. 14696 Annd ȝiff þu takesst bisne.
Ll. 14826, 14920 takesst bisne.
L. 14822 nimesst bisne.

Numerous uses of *bisne* with the verb "to give" occur:

Cf. l. 1230 gifeþþ bisne.
L. 3747 gifenn bisne.
L. 15004 gifenn bisne.
Also ll. 2688, 2908–9, 2914–15, 3747, 4238–39, 4885, 6668, 7350, 8763–64, 9068, 12969, 14944, 15741, 19640.

Bisne is also used with *follȝhenn:*

Cf. l. 2150 to follȝhenn hire bisne.
Also ll. 5289, 5609, 6651, 7718, 8058, 8987–8, 9005–6, 10214, 10948–49.

In the light of the foregoing evidence from Orm, there is no necessity of or justification for one's ascribing the verbal phrase "take example" in Middle English to the influence of Old French. The single word "example" doubtless came from that source.

5. "Take heed, take keep, take *ȝeme.*"

Mr. Sykes ascribes these three phrases to the influence of Old-French *prendre garde*, and, in the case of the last, also to *prendre cure.* It is to be noticed that the three words "heed," "keep," *ȝeme* are of Germanic origin, as is, of course, the verb "take." Of these words *ȝeme* is the only one in the *Ormulum* where it appears as *gom.* Its uses in Orm permit it to take any of the three meanings, so closely connected, of "heed," "keep," and *ȝeme.*

Orm:
Ll. 916–17 Forrþi þatt he ne namm nan gom
To fillenn all hiss wikenn.
Ll. 2910–11 þatt ȝuw birrþ nimenn mikell gom
Hu mikell pine itt follȝheþþ.
L. 4162 ȝiff þu þe sellf wel nimeþþ gom.
Ll. 5086, 6215.
L. 10950 ȝiff þatt he nimeþþ gom.
Ll. 13062, 14576 nimenn gom.
Ll. 14694–95 Annd ȝiff þu nimesst mikell gom
Till Abrahamess dede.
Ll. 14820, 14918.

Ll. 15014–15 Annd ȝiff þu takesst mikell gom
To follȝhenn Cristes bisne.
Ll. 15856–57 þurrh þatt he nimeþþ mikell gom
Whatt gate illc an himm ledeþþ.
Ll. 16136–37 þatt nohht niss off to nimenn gom
off naness manness eȝȝe.
L. 16930.
Ll. 16988–89 Himm haffde takenn mikell gom
off Cristess miccle tacness.
L. 18839 nimenn gom.
L. 19912 Ne namm nan gom off sinne.

6. "Take end."
Orm:
L. 8108 þatt daȝȝ þatt he toc ende.
L. 8252 Annd þaere he toc hiss ende.
Cf. l. 3243 he ȝaff hiss ende.
L. 17752 he ȝife hiss ende.

7. "Take wife."
Orm:
L. 3139 Annd toc wel wiþþ hiss macche.
L. 7663 þatt daȝȝ þatt ȝho toc macche.

8. "Take rest."
Orm:
L. 12991 Takenn reste.

Phrases found in the Old-Norse homiletic literature and not in Orm:

1. "Take cross."
Homilie-Bog:
P. 141, l. 24 er aeigi taecr cross sin.
Cf. l. 27 bera cross drotens.

2. "Bear name."
Leifar:
P. 64, l. 18 ef opt bera nǫfn hina.
Cf. p. 61, l. 18 þa taka þeir her nǫfn.
P. 165, l. 15 taca nǫfn af hino.

3. "Take order."
Leifar:
P. 67, l. 8 Ef tecr við boþorþom hans.

The foregoing observations on some phases of Mr. Sykes's dissertation, with the accompanying citation of verbal phrases from the Old Norse and the *Ormulum*, will serve, as the reader has no doubt already observed, at best merely to discredit much of the evidence offered by the author. The reason for my discussion of but one part of the essay is obvious.

The collection of verbal phrases with *beren*, *nimen*, *taken* from Orm is exhaustive. In itself it shows that the verbal phrasal power of Middle-English *taken* (Mr. Sykes dwells longest on this verb) is not pre-eminently Romance in character. The evidence from the Old Norse, I feel, is mainly contributory. These Old-Norse homilies and the *Ormulum* were composed about the same time. If the Old-Norse documents antedate the *Ormulum*,[1] the critic may be justified in ascribing to the Old Norse considerable verbal phrasal influence on Middle English of the verb *taka*, which had by itself gained so strong a foothold on English soil.

The chronology of the phrasal power of *taken*, as set forth by Mr. Sykes on page 22 of his dissertation, is partly in error. *Take baptism*, which he puts in the second half of the fourteenth century, is found virtually in Orm (the idea involved in the phrase and not the exact words being important). *Take flesh*, *take death*, and *take rest*, which Mr. Sykes puts in the first half of the fourteenth century, must likewise go back to the first quarter of the thirteenth century.

W. Owen Sypherd

Delaware College

[1] The reader will observe that the Old-Norse documents from which I quote bear earlier dates than the *Ormulum*. Other Old-Norse homiletic writings which show some of these phrases I have disregarded, either from uncertainty in regard to the date of composition or because they are probably of slightly later date.

NOTES ON SPANISH FOLKLORE

1. *Cuidar non es saber*

Tobler, Li dis dou vrai aniel, 1871, v. 104 note, was the first to show that the particular meaning of *cuidier* "*sich einbilden, wähnen*" is due to contrasting it with *savoir*.[1] Of this contrast the proverb has availed itself in different ways. After Tobler, and not remembering his note, P. Meyer, Romania XV, p. 299; XXVIII, p. 261, and Jeanroy, Annales du Midi XV, p. 214; Romania XXXIV, p. 518, pointed out French, resp. Provençal proverbs opposing the two verbs.

Of the French forms the two following interest me here:

1. Robert de Gretham,[2] Le Miroir ou les evangiles des domées 26 (Romania XV, p. 299) *E l'em dit en prover pur veir Qe quider n'est pas saveir.*

2. Cleomades 1231 (Tobler, l. c.) *Mais entre savoir et cuidance, Sachiez, a moult grant differance.*

The first form is attested for Provençal: Gavaudan, IV, 12, Romania XXXIV, p. 514 *cujars lai on no val valors Non es sabers ni sens.*

Both forms appear in Spanish:

1. Alexandre (Janer) 1586 *Mas diz assi el uiesso:*[3] *cuidar non es saber.* Sancho, Castigos, p. 173*a* *é por eso dice la palabra del proverbio: Cuidar non es saber.*[4] Santillana, p. 518

[1] I may mention here Lucanor (Knust), p. 255, 21 *El que sabe* [*cuida*] *que non sabe, el que non sabe cuyda que sabe.* The Varia Lectio reads: "[ ] G[ayangos (Bibl. de Aut. esp.)]; *sabe* S." A commentary is lacking. Knust was probably not responsible for the text nor for the V. L. nor for the lack of the commentary; for he would have known that Gayangos, p 428*a*, omits the whole first part of the saying. Further, he would have remembered his notes to Bocados de oro, p. 130*d*, and especially Burlaeus, p. 110*f* where, among other things, he quotes from Caro y Cejudo, p. 48: *Bien sabe el sabio que no sabe, el necio piensa que sabe.* Also without the testimony of Caro it is clear that we have to insert the reading of S: *sabe.*

[2] c. 1250.

[3] To be added to the list of names of the proverb given bei Cornu, Zweihundert altspanische Sprichwörter, p. 196 (Festschrift zum VIII. allgemeinen deutschen Neuphilologentage in Wien, 1898). Cf. also C. Michaëlis de Vasconcellos in Festschrift Adolf Tobler, 1905, p. 21, note 4.

[4] This instance and those from Santillana and Berceo have in the meantime been published by Cornu, op. cit., p. 198. Unless otherwise stated, I have my material at first hand.

Penssar non es saver. Refranes glosados,[1] Gallardo IV, c. 1129 *Pensar no es saber.* Torres Naharro I, p. 381 *el pensar no es saber.*

2. Berceo, Milagros (Janer) 127 *Mas a grant diferençia de saber a cuidar.*

A German "*Wähnen ist nicht wissen*" which lies so near, does not seem to occur. I find only Trutz Simplex [1670], p. 145 (Wander V, p. 304, no. 396) *Wissen und Meinen ist zweyerley*, with which may be compared Maurice de Sully, Dialogue du pere et du fils (Romania XXVIII, p. 260) *Biau fiz . . . . il te couvient tout avant savoir que est croire et qu'est cuidiers et qu'est savoirs; et sont .iij. choses.*

2. *Mulier prefertur viro*

P. Meyer, Romania VI, p. 501, has printed from a MS of the University of Cambridge (from the beginning of the fourteenth century) a résumé of theological arguments in favor of woman over against man:

Mulier prefertur viro, scilicet:
[I] *Materia:* Quia Adam factus de limo terre, Eva de costa Ade.
[II] *Loco:* Quia Adam factus extra paradisum, Eva in paradiso.
[III] *In conceptione:* Quia mulier concepit Deum, quod homo non potuit.
[IV] *Apparicione:* Quia Christus primo apparuit mulieri post resurrectionem, scilicet Magdalene.
[V] *Exaltacione:* Quia mulier exaltata est super choros angelorum, scilicet beata Maria.

French parallels have been indicated by P. Meyer, Romania VI, p. 501 (from Robert de Blois, L'onnour as dames—to II, III; [for a parallel to IV, see Ulrich's ed., III, p. 15, vss. 445 ff.]), XV, p. 321 (from La bounté des femmes—to I, III); further by Piaget, Martin Le Franc, 1888, p. 49 (from Jean Le Fèvre, Le livre de leesce—to I; [for parallels to II, III, see van Hamel's ed., vss. 1214 ff.]), p. 64 (from Christine de Pisan, L'epistre au dieu d'amours—to I; [for a parallel to II, see Roy's ed., vss. 604 ff.]), p. 107 (from Le Franc, Le livre du champion des dames—to ? [Piaget merely states: "On retrouve en partie ces arguments—là développés dans le Champion des Dames;" on p. 109 he refers to a parallel to I]).

[1] c. 1500.

P. Meyer, Romania XV, p. 321, has also pointed out two Provençal parallels (from the Comtessa de Dia[1]—to I, and from Serveri de Gerona—to I).

A South Italian parallel has been adduced by Risop, Zeitschr. d. Ver. f. Volkskunde XIII, p. 250 (from Loyse de Rosa—to I).

A Latin parallel has been referred to by van Hamel, op. cit., p. 242 (from Ambrosius, De paradiso—to II).

To these parallels I would add the following:

Absalon, abbas Sprinckirsbacensis,[2] Sermones festivales (Migne CCXI, c. 18) *Certe mulier in paradiso facta est, vir extra paradisum.*

Antonio Pucci [?], Il Propugnatore III, 1, p. 49:

Non so vedere per che cagione i filosafi e gli altri uomini si dilettarono di spregiare tanto le fenmine, conciò sia cosa che 'l Singniore del cielo e della terra degnò di venire in lei.

Ancora, dopo la sua passione, per la sua resurressione, apparì prima a lei che a l' uomo.

Ancora veggiamo apertamente che nella creazione ella fu fatta di più nobile cosa che l' uomo: però che l' uomo fu fatto di fango e la fenmina della costa dell' uomo; e poi fu fatta in più nobile luogo; però che Adamo, come detto è, in Ebrom,[3] Eva fue fatta nel Paradiso terreste.

Juan Rodríguez de la Cámara, Triunfo de las donas (Paz y Mélia), pp. 89 ff.:

La segunda razon (sc. dela excelencia delas dones (!) sobre los onbres) es por quanto dentro del parayso, en conpañya delos angeles formada, e non el onbre, que fue con las bestias enel campo damasçeno,[4] fuera del parayso, criado . . . .

La tercera, por auer seydo formada de carne purificada, e non del vapor dela tierra, dela qual el onbre e los otros animales fueron criados . . . .

La tricesima segunda razon es, por quanto ala muger, porque lo mas amó, segund Ambrosio lo dize en la Omelia,[5] e como touo firme esperança, primera mente por excelençia que a ningund onbre, resusçitando, apparesçio.

Diego Sanchez de Badajoz, Recopilacion II, pp. 7 ff. (dialogue between the shepherd and his wife):

[1] The quotation is in Latin. For its proper interpretation, see Piaget, op. cit., p. 165.

[2] †1203, Grōber, p. 197. [3] Cf. Graf, Miti I, p. 46.

[4] For the *ager damascenus* as the place where Adam was created, see Liebrecht to Gervasius von Tilbury, p. 53; Skeat to Chaucer, The Monkes Tale, 17 (Oxford, 1880, p. 175). Two more Spanish instances of the belief are Autos (Rouanet) II, pp. 180, 385; 217, 22.

[5] I have been unable to verify this reference.

ELLA. Ora, escucha ya, malsin,
Y verás cuán presto pruebo
Las ventajas que te llevo,
Aonque[1] sé poco latin.
Al principio fué criado
El hombre de tierra astrosa;
La mujer, de mejor cosa,
Del hombre vivo y formado;
Él hué de barro tomado,
Cosa muerta y ensensibre;
Ella, de carne apacibre,
De la costilla del lado.
¿Ves probada mi intencion
Del principio y principado?
Y al medio Dios hué encarnado
De mujer, no de varon . . . .
ÉL. . . . . Y por alzar lo caido
Quiso ensalzar la mujer.
ELLA. Tan alta y tan ensalzada,
Anque mas pese á roines,
Que sobre los serafines
En el cielo está asentada
Por señora y abogada,
Por luz y guía y estrella.[2]

Juan de Espinosa, Dialogo en lavde de las mvgeres (Sharbi, Refranero II, pp. 124, 128):

[la muger] fue criada enel Paraiso terrestre y el hombre fuera del Paraiso . . . .

la muger es notablemente mas noble, hauiendo el sido formado de tierra y ella del hombre.

[1] *Aon* is found as early as the Testo castellano del concilio de Leon (año de 1020) (from a copy of a MS s. XIII in Muñoz y Romero), pp. 74 *Mandamos á on que* . . . . 78 item.

Aon in rime occurs in Torres Naharro I, pp. 253, 367, 428; II, pp. 290, 292.

Later in the quotation we have *anque*, which is frequently met with in the Cancionero d'Herberay; Torres Naharro; Diego Sanchez; Santa Teresa; Ramón de la Cruz; Marin; the Cancionero panocho; Caveda, Poesías selectas en dialecto asturiano[2]; Fernandez y Morales, Ensayos poéticos en dialecto berciano.

As *áun* (*áon*) > *an*, so *aón* > *on*. Cf. for *on*, Juan del Encina, pp. 230, 231, 233, 235, 248; *onque* 229, 236, 246.

[2] The quotation is from the Farsa del matrimonio. I beg here to correct two statements of Creizenach III, pp. 119 and 159. That on p. 119 according tò which the Farsa del molinero of Diego Sanchez was published anonymously 1530, is a slip of the pen for Farsa del matrimonio. Cf. p. 126. Worse is that on p. 159: the edition of the Farsa del matrimonio of 1530 and reprinted by Gallardo I, cc. 929 ff., is dated 1542 and treated as a work different from that of Diego Sanchez.

To anyone having access to more works on Adam and Eve, and in praise of women, than I have, it will be easy to increase the number of these instances.

3. *Riddle Questions*

Among other versions of the "*Drei (Vier) Fragen*," Reinhold Köhler, Kleinere Schriften I, p. 492, cites those of the Orlandino (1527) of Teofilo Folengo, from which I excerpt:

Cerco saper da voi, quanto è vicino
Il Ciel da terra in ogni regione,
. . . .
Oltra di questo, dite giustamente,
Quanto è dall' Oriente all' Occidente.

The answers are:

Oggi voi mi faceste il primo assalto,
Ch'io narri quanto il Ciel da terra dista,
Presto rispondo, che gli è solo un salto,
Provandol senza il probo del Scotista:
. . . .
Perchè dall' Oriente all' Occidente
Una giornata fa, se'l Sol non mente.

In the "Adicion del Diálogo" (1517) of Torres Naharro II, p. 378, Patrispano and Herrando exchange, among other questions and answers, the following:

PA. Di, pariente,
Desde levante á poniente,
¿Cuánto habrá de cierta via?
HE. Una jornada valiente
Que la anda el sol cada dia.
PA. Poco yerra;
Pero, pues que en ti se encierra
Un saber ansí tan alto,
¿Cuánto hay del cielo á la tierra?
HE. Á la fé no hay más de un salto.

The first question and answer of the Orlandino are found elsewhere, cf. e. g. Child, No. 45; the rime-word *salto* here and in the corresponding version of Torres Naharro may be accidental, but receives some weight from the fact that the only parallel to the second question, known to me, is that from Torres Naharro Has Folengo been influenced by Torres Naharro?

4. *HOMO im Menschenangesicht*

Well known is Dante, Purg. XXIII, 32:

Chi nel viso degli uomini legge *omo*,
Ben avria quivi conosciuto l' emme.

Köhler II, p. 12, quotes another instance of this belief from Berthold von Regensburg, Bolte, ibid., one from Grillparzer. Here follows a Spanish one:

Diego Sanchez de Badajoz, Recopilacion I, p. 321:

Y de Dios ¿no sabeis vos
Lo que diz el nuestro cura?
Que su nombre y escretura
Puso en la cara de nos.
¿Veis? o: o: los ojos dos.
¿Veis la m en la nariz?
O, m—o—homo, hombre diz,
D—e—de—i—dei—de Dios.

5. *Die Ungleichheit der menschlichen Gesichter*

That the dissimilarity of human faces was considered one of the greatest miracles of God is attested by many instances, cf. Köhler II, p. 13, who gives among others, three Spanish instances (from Lucanor, the Libro de los exemplos and F. Caballero, Cuentos populares). The following may nevertheless be welcome:

Aucto de un milagro de sancto Andres 287 (Rouanet I, p. 477):

PAJE. Que milagro es el mayor
que en todo el genero humano
a hecho Dios de su mano
en la cosa mas menor?[1]

S. ANDRES. Di qu'es la diversidad
de caras que crio Dios,
que en tanta universidad
de propia conformidad
no ay tan solamente dos.

[1] Cf. S. Orosia (Fernández-Guerra) 444 *el mas menor de su grey*. Diego Sanchez I, p. 363 *contra las más mejores* (sc. bondades). Autos (Rouanet) I, pp. 141, 137 *es mas peor*. 491, 262 *muy muchas mas mayores* (sc. cosas). II, p. 361, 164 *comi las mas mejores* (sc. migas). Quatorze romances judéo-espagnols, Rev. hisp. X, p. 605 *la mula la mas mijor*. D. Quixote II, chap. 52 *no las* (sc. las vellotas) *hallê mas mayores*. For earlier examples see Meyer-Lübke, Gramm. III, §47 (*mas primero* also Alexandre 1843, Appoll. 143, Encina, p. 113). Cf. further Kolsen, Guiraut von Bornelh, p. 119; Abbott, A Shakespearian Grammar, 1881, §11.—Similarly we find the absolute superlative with *muy* or *bien:* Autos I, p. 235, 86 *de muy finisimo oro*. Rubí, Poesías andaluzas², p. 31 / *tiene ustê muy poquísima criansa!*—D. Quixote II, chap. 24 *doy por bien empleadissima la jornada*.

6. *Und wenn der Himmel wär Papier*

In the great number of versions of this formula, collected by Köhler III, p. 293, there is only one in Spanish (from the Libro de los engannos = Bonilla's ed., l. 1281). For an instance from Spanish popular poetry, Köhler, p. 306 note, refers to Segarra, Poesías populares, Leipzig, 1862, p. 131 (not accessible to me).[1] Bolte, Zeitschr. d. Ver. f. Volkskunde XII, p. 171, has brought forward three more parallels (from Truebas, Cuentos campesinos, from Marin, Cantos populares españoles, and one from Venezuela). That from Marin (IV, p. 91, 6241) reads:

Si la mar fuera de tinta
Y el cielo fuera papel,
No se podria escribir
Lo falsa que es la mujer.

Marin possibly got his version from Lafuente, Cancionero popular[2] II, 53.[2] The same form occurs in Murcian:

Diaz Cassou, López Almagro and García López, El cancionero panocho, Madrid, 1900, p. 56:

Manque[3] la mar juera e tinta
y er cielo juera papel,
faltaría pa escrebir
lo farsa qu'es la mujer.

Lafuente offers besides:

p. 53 Si la mar fuera de tinta,
Y el cielo de papel doble,
No se pudiera escribir
Lo falsos que son los hombres.

p. 140 Si la mar fuera de tinta,
Y de papel fuera el cielo,
No te pudiera escribir
Lo mucho que yo te quiero.

K. PIETSCH

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

[1] As Segarra is one of the authorities consulted by Lafuente, Köhler's instance may be among those I quote from Lafuente.

[2] Lafuente reads *pudiera*.

[3] Meyer-Lübke, Gramm. I, §587, treats "andal. *manque* = *masque*" like *manzana*, *ninguno*, *mancilla*, etc. Schuchardt, Zeitschr. f. rom. Phil. V, p. 311, had suggested "Einmischung von *aunque*." Similarly Marin II, p. 187. *Manque* is in fact a contamination of *masque* and *anque*.

SOURCE OF THE PETRONEL–WINIFRED PLOT IN "EASTWARD HOE"

Professor Schelling in his edition of *Eastward Hoe*[1] says: "The seekers after sources find no immediate model for *Eastward Hoe*." He cautions the reader seeking for sources to avoid evident similarities, but in reading further we see he is concerning himself with the plot which involves Quicksilver. True, it is dangerous to trace such a thin story as that of Quicksilver, but the romantic story of the abduction of Security's wife, Winifred, is directly or indirectly drawn from Masuccio, who was one of the school of the early Italian novelists so often resorted to by the Elizabethan dramatists.

In the thirty-fourth and fortieth novels of Masuccio[2] may be found almost every detail of the romantic part of *Eastward Hoe*. The main plot of this romantic story consists in making the husband the unknowing participator in his own wife's abduction. This is also the main theme of both novels of Masuccio. In the following outline of the Petronel-Winifred story in *Eastward Hoe* eleven or more details are paralleled in the two novels of Masuccio.

In *Eastward Hoe* Sir Petronel forms a plot to carry off Winifred, the young wife of old Security, a jealous and miserly usurer. In Act II, sc. 3, l. 116, Petronel speaks of Winifred as being young. In Act III, sc. 1, l. 13, Security speaks of himself as being "something in years." In Act II, sc. 3, l. 124, Sir Petronel says of Security: "It falls out excellently, fitly: I see desire of gain makes jealousy venturous." In the fortieth novel the wife is young, the husband old and jealous. In the thirty-fourth novel the same situation exists, and the husband is both miserly and jealous.

In the play no emphasis is laid on the winning-over of Winifred by Sir Petronel. This is the case in both novels.

[1] Belles Lettres Series (Boston, 1903).

[2] The edition of Signor Settembrini (Naples, 1874).

In the play, Security, duped by the false friendship of Sir Petronel, begs him to stand godfather if he has a child, saying, in Act III, sc. 1, ll. 14–17: "I vow faithfully unto you to make you godfather, though in your absence, to the first child I am blessed withal, and henceforth call me gossip, I beseech you, if you please to accept it." In the fortieth novel the husband beseeches the abductor to be gossip, although his wife was then childless.

In Act III, sc. 1, ll. 20–22, Sir Petronel says: "Let me entreat my fair gossip, your wife here, to accept this diamond and keep it as my gift to her first child." In the fortieth novel the abductor says: "I intend on my return that your wife and my dear gossip shall be made glad by the present of a gown of the finest quality which I will give her."

In Act III, sc. 1, ll. 25–29, Security says to his wife: "How now, my coy wedlock; make you strange of so noble a favor? Take it, I charge you, with all affection, and, by way of taking your leave, present boldly your lips to our honorable gossip." In the fortieth novel the husband says to the wife: "Now embrace our dear gossip and give him a loving kiss."

In Act III, sc. 2, ll. 259–96, Sir Petronel invents a by-plot to draw Security from his home in order that the abduction of his wife may take place. The by-plot is this: He tells Security that he wishes to abduct Bramble's wife. Bramble, the lawyer, is Security's neighbor. In order to get Bramble away from his wife, he asks Security to bring his neighbor to the tavern so that they may both take a last farewell of Sir Petronel. In the meantime, Sir Petronel says, he will send his friend Quicksilver to bring Bramble's wife disguised to the tavern, where Security can see her abducted before the old lawyer's face. Security gleefully falls in with this by-plot, by which he himself is gulled. Now, in the fortieth novel the same by-plot occurs. The would-be abductor pretends to the husband that he wishes to carry off a seafaring man's wife. He asks the husband to get the seafaring man away from his wife by hiring him to take them all on board ship in his row-boat. In the meantime, the abductor says, he will send his servant to bring the seafaring man's wife disguised to the seashore, where the husband can see the sailor's wife abducted before

his face. The husband gleefully falls in with this plan, by which he is as easily gulled as Security.

In Act III, sc. 2, ll. 309–12, Sir Petronel sends Quicksilver after Security's wife instead of Bramble's. In the fortieth novel the abductor sends his servant after the husband's wife instead of the seafaring man's.

In the play the abduction is accomplished by means of a ship in the harbor ready to sail for Virginia. In both novels the abduction is also by sea.

In Act III, sc. 3, ll. 153–69, Winifred weeps, and Security comforts her in the following manner:

> Pity of all true love, Mistress Bramble; what, weep you to enjoy your love? What's the cause, lady? Is it because your husband is so near, and your heart yearns to have a little abused him? Alas! the offense is too common to be respected. So great a grace hath seldom chanced to so unthankful a woman; to be rid of an old, jealous dotard, to enjoy the arms of a loving, young knight, that when your Bramble is withered with grief of your loss, will make you flourish afresh in the bed of a lady.

In the fortieth novel the husband comforts his disguised wife in the following way:

> Ah, you pretty rogue, who makes you weep? Perchance you grieve at the sight here of your husband whom you are leaving; if this be so, you astonish me mightily, seeing you are going to better your lot many a hundred-fold. Let no doubts trouble you; for in lieu of being poor and ill-served, you will become the mistress of great riches. I well know how my good gossip loves you; wherefore be sure that he will make you the mistress of his person and of all his goods; for no men in all the world know so well as Catalans how to love and entertain fair ladies.

The trick of making the duped husband jest at his own expense occurs in *Eastward Hoe* and in the thirty-fourth novel, although in the latter the answer of the husband is exactly the reverse of that in the play. Bramble, in *Eastward Hoe*, says to Security: "But is not that your wife, neighbor?" Security replies: "No, by my troth, Master Bramble. Ha, ha, ha! A pox of all cuckold's-havens, I say!" In the thirty-fourth novel, as the husband is escorting his disguised wife through Bari thinking her someone else, street ruffians ask him whither he is taking the lady. He

replies: "This is my wife, and I am taking her that she may earn somewhat by ensnaring gallants at Taranto."

In the thirty-fourth novel the abductor takes much precaution because he knows that the husband will make a great uproar when he finds his wife gone. Compare the bellowing of Security when he returns and sees he is duped in Act III, sc. 4.

Surely, the fact that the mainspring of the plot of *Eastward Hoe* and at least eleven details find parallels in Masuccio should persuade one to think this old Italian novelist either the direct or the indirect source of the play. The next editor of the play will have an interesting problem in determining whether Jonson, Chapman, or Marston used Masuccio.

HARLOW DUNHAM CURTIS

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

HERDER'S "URSPRUNG DER SPRACHE"

In 1769 the Berlin Academy gave out as the subject of a competitive prize essay the following, couched, as was customary, in French: "En supposant les hommes abandonnés à leurs facultés naturelles, sont ils en état d'inventer le langage? et par quels moyens parviendront-ils d'eux-mêmes à cette invention?" There are two points in the wording of this theme which are interesting and characteristic of the time. In the first place, it will be noticed that the pivot of the discussion was to be this: whether language was of natural—i. e., human—or supernatural origin. It could by no means be taken for granted then, as normal investigators would nowadays, that the gift of speech was acquired by man in a purely normal way; the burden of proof, in fact, lay upon those who disputed the divine origin of language. In the second place, the query of the academy speaks of language as an "invention." Just as a machine is a tool, a means for bringing about certain desired mechanical effects, so language was looked upon as a tool, a means for bringing about certain other desired mechanical effects—namely: the communication of ideas by means of audible, secondarily by means of visible, symbols. And since history and experience showed, or seemed to show, that machines were "invented" by the application of certain powers of intelligence, the logic of parallelism seemed to require that also that most admirable tool called language should have been the "invention" of some intelligence. The only question, then, was this: Was the human mind intelligent and resourceful enough to invent so fine a machine, or did the latter require the master-hand of the Deity? *Voilà tout.*

The attitude of a modern linguist toward the proposed subject is certainly very different from that of the eighteenth-century philosopher. To the first half of the question he would unhesitatingly answer "Yes;" to the second he would reply: "Language was not invented in any true sense at all;" or, as Topsy would

put it: "It wasn't born, it growed." It is in these two points, after all, that the chief progress from the older to the modern view of the question lies; and for both of them, the doing away with the conception of divine interference, and the introduction of the idea of slow, but gradual and necessary, development from rude beginnings, we are very largely indebted to Herder. The very answer that Herder gave to the question posed made the question itself meaningless; henceforth there could be no serious and profitable discussion of the divine origin of language, while the crude conception of the "invention" of a language had to give way more and more to that of the unconscious, or, as we should perhaps say now, largely subconscious, development of speech by virtue of man's psychic powers. The question resolved itself into another: Just what factor or factors were most prominent in that exceedingly slow process of mental evolution that transformed a being giving vent to his emotions in inarticulate cries to one giving expression to a rich mental life by an elaborate system of auditory symbols? Despite the vast accumulation of linguistic material that has been collected since Herder's time, and the immense clarification that has been attained in linguistic conceptions, processes, and classifications, we cannot today make bold to assert that this problem is satisfactorily answered, or apparently in a way to be satisfactorily answered in the immediate future. Bearing this in mind, we shall be able more justly to value the great service Herder accomplished in merely shifting the point of view. That alone was an inestimable service.

It was to be expected that the proposed subject should appeal strongly to a mind of Herder's stamp, occupied, as it was, with problems touching the most important phases of human culture. We thus find him, while still in Nantes, writing to his publisher-friend Hartknoch that he was intending to work up the theme the following year. He speaks of it as "eine vortreffliche, grosse und wahrhaftig philosophische Frage, die recht für mich gegeben zu sein scheint."[1] The latest time at which the competing essays could be handed in was January 1, 1771; yet Herder did not set to work at the actual composition of his treatise until well on in

[1] R. Haym, *Herder nach seinem Leben und seinen Werken dargestellt*, Vol. I, pp. 400–403.

December, 1770, when his Strassburg period was drawing to a close. To excuse the peculiar defects of it, he wrote to Nicolai early in 1772 that it was written "flüchtig, in Eile, in den letzten Tagen des Decembers."[1] So rapidly, indeed, was this 166-page[2] essay composed that it was finished even before Christmas and was sent away anonymously, with accompanying billet, to Tourney, the secretary of the academy. This almost incredible rapidity of composition can be explained only by assuming, as we have every reason to do, that Herder had thought out the whole problem in considerable detail long before, or, as Suphan suggests, even made the first rough draft[3] at Nantes, and had now simply to mold these ideas into literary form. Although few would venture to call the *Preisschrift* a model of literary form, yet the distinctness of the theme and the short time in which it had to be got ready give the treatise "a directness and ease that is too often wanting in his other works."[4] In few other subjects had Herder been so deeply interested up to 1771 as in this one concerning the origin and development of language. As early as 1764, according to Suphan, he had drawn up a plan for the somewhat elaborate investigation of the origin of language, writing, and grammar. One of his contributions to the Riga *Gelehrte Anzeigen* dealt with the problem, "Wie weit alte und neue, fremde und die Muttersprache unsern Fleiss verdienen"—an essay that anticipates some of the striking phrases found in the *Preisschrift*. In his first important work, the famous *Fragmente*, Herder had already given expression to some of his later thoughts, among other things maintaining the human origin of language. When Süssmilch's *Beweis, dass die Sprache göttlich sei*, which had been read at the Berlin Academy ten years before publication, appeared in 1766, Herder was deeply interested, and wrote to Scheffner (October 31, 1767): "Da Süssmilch sich in die Sprachhypothese neulich gemischt und es mit Rousseau gegen Moses [i. e., Moses Mendelssohn] aufgenommen, so hätte ich wohl Lust,

[1] Haym, *op. cit.*

[2] As contained in Herder's *Collected Works*, edited by Johann von Müller (Carlsruhe, 1820).

[3] Distinguished by Suphan as "a." See p. xii, Vol. V, of his edition.

[4] Nevinson, *Herder and His Times*, p 162.

auch ein mal ein Paar Worte öffentlich zu sagen."[1] With what had been said on the subject by Rousseau, Condillac, Abbt, Lambert, and others, Herder was well acquainted, so that his own *Preisschrift*, while in every sense a *pathfinding* work, takes a definite historically conditioned place in the linguistic-philosophic speculations of the eighteenth century.

Before proceeding with the detailed analysis of Herder's epoch-making work, we must briefly consider the theories on the origin of language which prevailed at the time he wrote it. By far the most commonly held theory, at least in Germany, was that supported by Süssmilch, the orthodox view. According to this, language was given or revealed to man by God. The power to create the subtle mechanism of speech was considered by the supporters of this theory beyond the earliest human beings; they had to receive the first rude concept of language, the first fruitful suggestions, at least, from without. In earlier stages of linguistic speculation, particularly at the time of the Reformation, it was believed, on inferred biblical evidence, that this earliest God-made language was the Hebrew tongue, from which all other idioms, the Greek and Latin as well as the Chinese, were derived by processes of corruption, transposition of letters, or what not. In Herder's day, however, it was no longer considered necessary by all supporters of the orthodox view to maintain the absolute primitiveness of Hebrew, although Hebrew was regarded, among others by Herder himself, as a peculiarly primitive or "original" language. Many deemed it sufficient to assert the revelation to man of *some* form, however imperfect, of speech, and were willing to concede the possibly somewhat late advent of the Holy Tongue. We can easily understand some of the reasons that led to the support of this, it is needless to say, now wholly antiquated view. In the first place, scriptural evidence, in general, seemed to imply the divine origin of language; although we are told that the Lord brought the various denizens of the field and forest before Adam, that he might give them names, still this appears to have been done under careful paternal supervision. In the second place, there was good, in fact irrefutable, evidence, from an orthodox

[1] See Haym, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 402.

point of view, for the divine authorship of the industries; and it seemed illogical to suppose that a much higher factor of civilization than the industries, namely language, had been left to the ingenuity of primitive man. In the third place, the less than six thousand years which had elapsed since the creation of the world were looked upon, and with good reason, as quite inadequate for the development from the crudest possible beginnings of our modern, richly organized languages. Even long after Herder had demonstrated the untenableness of the orthodox theory, many scholars still clung to a view which made God, as Goethe put it, "a kind of omnipotent schoolmaster." I note, by way of illustration, that our Noah Webster still considered it the most probable explanation. From a psychological point of view, granting the possibility of revelation, the theory is, of course, absolutely useless. Its advocates do not seem to have perceived that the imparting of a language to the first speechless human beings, accompanied, as it presumably was, by grammatical instruction, must have been a fairly impossible task, implying, in fact, linguistic training in the recipient; moreover, the theory begged the question, by assuming the existence of what it set out to explain. The modern critical standpoint has been well, if somewhat cynically, formulated by Fritz Mauthner in his entertaining *Kritik der Sprache:*

> Wir wissen kaum, was der abstrakte Begriff Sprache bedeutet, wir wissen noch weniger, wie wir den Begriff Ursprung zeitlich begrenzen sollen, wir wissen gar nicht mehr den Gottesbegriff zu definieren; da können wir mit dem "göttlichen Ursprung der Sprache" wirklich nicht mehr viel anfangen.[1]

A second theory, supported notably by Rousseau and the German Rationalists, was very similar in character to the contract-theory of the origin of government, also held by Rousseau. They conceived the matter approximately thus: Primitive men, after having long been compelled to get along without speech, at last awoke to a consciousness of the manifold inconveniences of their then condition; were in particular troubled by the important problem of communicating ideas. To remedy, if possible, this

[1] Fritz Mauthner, *Kritik der Sprache*, Vol. II, "Zur Sprachwissenschaft," p. 353.

deplorable state of affairs, our primitive ancestors, or perhaps only the wisest of them, put their heads together to devise ways and means for the more practicable interchange of thoughts. After much cogitation—not deliberation, for language was not as yet—they hit upon the excellent device of representing things and actions to each other by means of arbitrarily chosen symbols, presumably auditory. Henceforth they had no difficulty in understanding each other, civilization progressed more rapidly than heretofore, and all was well. One is amazed to find that men in the eighteenth century were willing to maintain so ridiculous a theory, even if not presented in quite so absurd a light as above. It is not difficult to point out the vicious circle implied therein. Man could not conceivably have advanced so far as to perceive the advantages of speech as a means of communication without already being possessed of it; on the other hand, if primitive man could already successfully communicate such abstract ideas as those of symbols, one fails to see the necessity of a change in method.

A far more valuable theory than these two was that held by the English and French "naturalists," though a crude, mechanistic psychology makes their speculations often seem rather infantile today. The "naturalists," generally speaking, were inclined to look upon language as a reflex, expressed in cries, of the sensations and perceptions imprinted upon the human mind by man's environment. They considered the growth of a vocabulary absolutely co-ordinated with the growth of experience, and were pretty sure, most of them, that untaught children, if isolated from the companionship of their fellow-beings, would develop a language of their own. Condillac, probably the most profound of the *philosophes*, attempted in his *Essai sur l'origine des connaissances humaines* to show how two human beings of opposite sex might naturally be led to acquire speech. He supposes that at the outset all their desires and emotions are expressed by purely instinctive cries, accompanied by violent gestures. By the psychic processes of memory and association these cries gradually come to serve as the fixed means of communicating the more elementary feelings, such as fear, joy, and the like. Says Condillac:

Meanwhile, while these human beings have acquired the habit of associating several ideas with arbitrary signs, the natural cries served them as model to make a new language. They articulated new sounds and, repeating them several times and accompanying them by some gesture which indicated the objects they wished to call attention to, they accustomed themselves to giving names to things. At first the progress of this language was extremely slow. The organ of speech was so inflexible that it could articulate only a few very simple sounds. The obstacles that presented themselves in pronouncing others even prevented them from suspecting that the voice was capable of moving beyond the small number of words they had imagined. This pair had a child, who, pressed by wants that he could give expression to only with difficulty, violently moved all the limbs of his body. His very flexible tongue curled itself in an extraordinary manner and pronounced an entirely new word. The want, still continuing, again gave rise to the same effects; this child moved his tongue as before, and again articulated the same sound. The surprised parents, having finally guessed what he wished, attempted, while giving it to him, to repeat the same word. The difficulty they had in pronouncing it made it evident that they would not of themselves have been able to invent it.[1]

In such wise Condillac thinks their language would be slowly and painfully enriched; not until after many generations would a language in our sense be approximated. A fairly ingenious theory, and much to be preferred to either the orthodox or the rationalist views, yet not truly convincing. The great difficulty that Herder found with it was the failure to draw a sharp line between the instincts of the animals and the higher mental powers of man. One does not clearly see why, according to Condillac, the animals should not have likewise developed a language. Herder, although he inclined on the whole to the views of the French "naturalists," attempted to avoid their shallow mechanistic psychology, and was chiefly concerned in showing that the peculiarly human faculty of speech was a *necessary correlative* of certain distinctly human psychic conditions.

The analysis of Herder's views here given is based, not on the second edition of the prize essay (Berlin, 1789), but on its first published form (Berlin, 1772), as given in Suphan's edition of Herder. Following the formulation of the academy's theme, he divided his treatise into two parts, the first answering the ques-

[1] *Œuvres de Condillac* (Paris, 1798), Vol. I, pp. 264, 265.

tion: "Haben die Menschen, ihren Naturfähigkeiten überlassen, sich selbst Sprache erfinden können?"[1] the second dealing with the problem: "Auf welchem Wege der Mensch sich am füglichsten hat Sprache erfinden können und müssen?"[2]

Herder begins his treatise with the postulation of a "natural law." All the higher animals involuntarily respond to their emotions, particularly the more intense ones, such as pain, by cries. As Herder formulates the "law": "Here is a sentient being, unable to inclose within itself any of its intense feelings; which, in the first moment of surprise, must give expression in sound to every feeling, even without intention and purpose."[3] But this sentient being is not an isolated phenomenon. There are other beings, besides itself, similarly constituted, that respond to like stimuli in the same way. Hence the instinctive cries of each sentient being find a responsive echo in other beings of like organism, very much as a vibrating string will cause other strings to vibrate that are pitched in harmony to itself. These tones constitute a species of language, "a language of feeling" directly given by nature (*unmittelbares Naturgesetz*); its genesis it does not occur to Herder to explain. Such natural cries are not peculiar to the animals, but are shared also by man. No matter how highly developed a language may be, it always includes a number of vocables that are intelligible *per se* as emotional expressions. These are represented on paper—with miserable inadequacy, as Herder strongly emphasizes—by the interjections (such as *ach*, *O*, and so forth); their real existence, however, is in their utterance in the appropriate emotional milieu. It is true that in our modern, metaphysically refined idioms, these emotional elements play a very subordinate rôle, but in the older oriental and in the primitive tongues Herder thinks to find more numerous survivals of the earliest linguistic conditions. It may be noted that all through the essay Herder, quite uncritically from our modern point of view, considers the oriental, by which he means one or two Semitic, dialects and the languages of primi-

[1] *Herder's Sämmtliche Werke*, herausgegeben von Bernhard Suphan (Berlin, 1891), Vol. V, p. 3.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 91.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 6.

tive peoples as essentially more "original" than our modern vernaculars. We should never forget that Herder's time-perspective was necessarily very different from ours. While we unconcernedly take tens and even hundreds of thousands of years in which to allow the products of human civilization to develop, Herder was still compelled to operate with the less than six thousand years that orthodoxy stingily doled out. To us the two or three thousand years that separate our languages from the Old Testament Hebrew seems a negligible quantity, when speculating on the origin of language in general; to Herder, however, the Hebrew and the Greek of Homer seemed to be appreciably nearer the oldest conditions than our vernaculars—hence his exaggeration of their *Ursprünglichkeit.* The supposedly "primitive," or rather "original," character of the languages of savages was due to a very natural, though, unfortunately, on the whole erroneous, conclusion from *à priori* considerations.

Herder next proceeds to take up and refute one of Süssmilch's arguments for believing that language is God's direct work. Süssmilch contended that it was evident in the alphabetic uniformity of all languages, pointing to an original divine simplicity; all the sounds found in the multiform idioms of the earth, he thought, could be adequately represented by about twenty letters. This queer argument Herder conclusively showed to be a mere orthographic quibble. It is a huge fallacy, as Herder clearly saw, to imagine that even *one* language could be perfectly represented by an alphabet at all, let alone one of twenty letters. He recognizes, apparently as clearly as any modern linguist, that the real elements of language are spoken sounds of which letters are but makeshift and imperfect substitutions. He quotes from travelers as to the extreme difficulty of representing many of the dialects of primitive peoples through the medium of our letters; but he calls attention also to the very faint idea that one gets of even spoken English and French from the written forms of those languages. That a comparatively "original" language (I speak in Herder's terms) like the Hebrew did not orthographically represent the vowels is due, he thinks, to their finely modulated, natural, almost unarticulated character. "Ihre Ausprache war so

lebendig und feinorganisiert, ihr Hauch war so geistig und athemisch, dass er verduftete und sich nicht in Buchstaben fassen liess."[1] Hence he concludes that the nearer a language comes to the original conditions, the less possible to mirror it in orthographical symbols.

After this digression on the Süssmilch argument, Herder returns to a consideration of the natural emotional sounds of man and the animals: he emphasizes the great influence that these still have emotionally, and sees in them the closest bond of union between the various members of animated creation. "Their origin," Herder declares, "I consider very natural. It is not only not superhuman, but evidently beastlike (*thierisch*), the natural law of a machine capable of feeling."[2] But—and here comes a critical point in Herder's argument—it is impossible to explain the origin of human language from these emotional cries.

> All animals, down to the dumb fish, give vent to their feelings in tones; but no animal, not even the most perfect, has on that account the slightest genuine disposition toward a human language. Let one form and refine and fix this natural cry as one will; if no understanding is present, so as purposely to use the tone, I fail to see how human, conscious language is ever going to arise. Children utter emotional sounds, like animals: is not the language, however, that they learn from men quite another idiom?[3]

All writers, notably Condillac and Maupertuis among the French *philosophes*, and Diodorus and Vitruvius among the ancients, that have attempted to derive human speech from instinctive animal cries, are, then, on the wrong path at the very outset of their investigations. Since, among all living beings, man alone has developed a language, in the ordinary sense of the word, and since it is, after all, this power of speech which chiefly separates man from the animals, any rational attempt to explain its origin would have to begin with a consideration of the essential psychic differences between the two. Herder, consequently, proceeds to seek for the most fundamental of these psychic differences, and finds it in this, "that man is far inferior to the animals in strength and sureness of *instinct;* indeed, that he lacks

[1] Herder, *op. cit.*, p. 13. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 17. [3] *Ibid.*, pp. 17, 18.

entirely what in so many animal species we term inborn art-capabilities or impulses (*Kunstfähigkeiten und Kunsttriebe*)."[1] This inferiority in instinctive power Herder ascribes to a greater sphere of attention and activity on the part of man. Herder finds by observation "that the sharper the senses of the animals, and the more wonderful their works of art, the narrower their sphere, the more uniform their art-work;"[2] and inversely, "the more scattered their attention to various objects, the more undefined their mode of life, in short, the larger and more manifold their sphere, the more do we see their sense-powers divided and weakened."[3] Now all instincts, even such complicated ones as those we see manifested in the construction of beehives and spider-webs, are to be explained by the intense, specialized activities of the senses within a narrow sphere. Hence Herder feels justified in assuming that intensity of the senses and perfection of instinct are in inverse proportion to the amplitude of the sphere of attention. Since man has the widest possible sphere, is the least specialized of all creatures in his activity, it follows that he is least endowed with inborn mechanical dispositions; in other words, is at birth apparently the most helpless of all living beings. It is inconceivable, however, that nature should have acted in so stepmotherly a fashion as to intend man for the widest field of activity, and at the same time fail to grant him powers successfully to maintain himself in his complex environment. There must be some psychic element which secures him his due position in the world; if we succeed in discovering this psychic element, we shall also have obtained the distinctive characteristic of man; and if, furthermore, we can show the human faculty of speech to be a resultant of this mental characteristic, our problem is practically solved. The peculiarly human characteristic sought is conditioned by the wide range of attention; for this latter implies that the human senses, unrestricted to any narrowly specialized field, are left free for development and the acquisition of *clearer* impressions. Now, this clearness of view leads to what is variously termed understanding, reason, judgment. Herder, who is alone to be held responsible for the psychology of all this,

[1] *Op. cit.*, p. 22. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 22. [3] *Ibid.*, p. 23.

is indifferent about the name applied (he himself suggests *Besonnenheit*, "reflection"); he very strongly emphasizes, however, that this *Besonnenheit* is not a faculty superimposed upon the lower animal mind-elements and transforming them into the human mind, but rather a certain disposition or aspect of the really unanalyzable unity called the "mind." It is truly refreshing to find Herder, in the age of neatly pigeon-holed faculties, boldly asserting these to be but more or less convenient abstractions; to Herder the human "mind" is an indivisible entity, in no wise genetically related to the animal mind. As he expresses it: "Der Unterschied (zwischen der menschlichen und der tierischen Seele) ist nicht in Stufen, oder Zugabe von Kräften, sondern in einer ganz verschiedenartigen Richtung und Auswickelung aller Kräfte."[1] Furthermore, *Besonnenheit* must have been present in the human race from the very start, must have been implanted in it by the Creator; although this, of course, does not mean that it is not capable of growth with the increase of experience. Any attempt, then, to bridge over the gulf separating man and the animal world is to Herder absurd.

Does not reflection or *Besonnenheit*, however, imply the invention — or, better, genesis — of language? Herder proceeds:

> [Der Mensch] beweiset Reflexion, wenn er aus dem ganzen schwebenden Traum der Bilder, die seine Seele vorbeistreichen, sich in ein Moment des Wachens sammlen, auf einem Bilde freiwillig verweilen, es in helle ruhigere Obacht nehmen, und sich Merkmale absondern kann, dass dies der Gegenstand und kein andrer sei. Er beweiset auch Reflexion, wenn er nicht bloss alle Eigenschaften lebhaft oder klar erkennen; sondern eine oder mehrere als unterscheidende Eigenschaften bei sich anerkennen kann; der erste Aktus dieser Anerkenntniss[2] giebt deutlichen Begriff; est ist das erste Urtheil der Seele.[3]

Further, the singling out and apperception of any attribute, the formation of a clear concept, is in itself, in the true sense of the word, language, even though it be not uttered; for language can very well be defined as series of associated attributes or concepts, symbolically interpreted. For the purpose of illustration, Herder

[1] Herder, *op. cit.* p. 29.

[2] By *Anerkenntniss* Herder means about as much as "apperception."

[3] *Op. cit.*, p. 35.

supposes a sheep to pass by primitive man.[1] The latter, with mind unobscured by the wolfish instinct to tear the sheep to pieces, will, by virtue of his power of *Besonnenheit*, quietly perceive the white, wooly phenomenon. Suddenly the sheep bleats; involuntarily primitive man picks out this remarkable sound as the characteristic attribute in the complex of sensations presented to him by the sheep. The sheep crosses his path once again. Primitive man, not yet fully practiced in the apperception of objects, does not at first recognize his wooly friend. But the sheep again bleats, whereupon he remembers the similar sound heard before; the characteristic attribute then, in this case the bleating, serves to establish the identity of the two sensation-groups. Ever thereafter the remembered audible image of bleating will associate itself with the totality of images, visual, tactile, and others, that go to make up the phenomenon *sheep*. Does not this mean that the image of bleating becomes the *name* of the object, even though the speech-organs of primitive man never attempt to reproduce the sound? With the acquisition of a number of constant images of apperceived attributes language is now fairly begun, and is shown to be, in Herder's opinion, a necessary corollary of the postulated *Besonnenheit*, peculiar to man.

At this point Herder takes up certain arguments advanced by some to prove the impossibility of the human origin of language. Süssmilch contended that without the use of language no act of reason was possible. Consequently man, in order to reason, must have been in prior possession of the gift of speech. But it is impossible that he should have himself invented it; for reason, not yet in operation, would evidently have been necessary therefor. The only way out of the difficulty, then, is to assume that God first taught man the use of language, by the employment of which the exercise of reason followed. Herder has no difficulty in showing the circle in the argument. If man was to grasp the linguistic instruction of God, and not simply repeat his words in parrot-like manner, he must already have been in possession of an elaborate complex of concepts and, therefore, also of language; for, according to his analysis, the genesis of the two is

[1] The illustration was borrowed by Herder from Moses Mendelssohn.

simultaneous. To seek a parallel for divine instruction in the language-teaching of children by their parents is of no avail. The child recognizes most attributes and acquires his store of concepts by his own unaided experience—that is, the real acquisition of language is his own unaided work; all that the parents do is to force him to label his stock of concepts with those arbitrary symbols which they happen to use themselves.

So far Herder has discussed only the singling-out of attributes in general. The question now arises which attributes are most likely to be picked out originally as the first elements of language. The sense of sight, Herder believes, develops at the start with too great difficulty to allow visual attributes to be seized upon as the characteristic ones of objects; moreover, light-phenomena are too "cold" (this is Herder's term) to appeal to primitive man. The lower senses, notably that of touch, on the other hand, receive impressions that are too coarse and undefined for the purposes of speech. It remains, then, for the sense of hearing to give the characteristic attributes and, as Herder expresses it, become *Lehrmeister der Sprache.* Thus the sheep, as we have seen, becomes to man the "bleater;" the dog, the "barker;" the wind, the "rustler;" and so on indefinitely. The abstraction, then, of sound-attributes, coupled with a mechanical and spontaneous imitation of these, forms the first vocabulary of man. The biblical sentence, "Gott führte die Thiere zu ihm, dass er sähe, wie er sie nennte, und wie er sie nennen würde, so sollten sie heissen," Herder chooses to consider a poetical, peculiarly oriental rendition of the soberly expressed philosophic truth: "Der Verstand, durch den der Mensch über die Natur herrschet, war der Vater einer lebendigen Sprache, die er aus Tönen schallender Wesen zu Merkmalen der Unterscheidung sich abzog."[1]

If language were the invention of the Creator, we should expect to see his spirit—that is, pure reason—reflected in his work. But such is by no means the case. Pure reason or logic would require us to seek nouns as the most original constituents of the vocabulary of a language; for evidently, in strictly logical reasoning, the subject comes before the predicate, the thing

[1] Herder, *op. cit.*, p. 50.

that acts before the action. As a matter of fact, however, the radical elements of languages are not substantive in character, but verbal; this we can explain, if we bear in mind that primitive man was most impressed by sounding actions (*tönende Handlungen*). Since these actions were manifested in certain objects, it followed that the latter were named by the same natural sounds as the former; thus we have *nouns* developing out of *verbs*, and not vice versa. "The child names the sheep, not as sheep, but as a bleating animal, and thus turns the interjection into a verb."[1] All old and primitive languages clearly show, Herder is very sure, the verbal origin of nouns, and a philosophically arranged dictionary of an oriental language would be "a chart of the course of the human spirit, a history of its development, and . . . . the most excellent proof of the creative power of the human soul."[2] It is somewhat strange to find as keen a mind as Herder's occupying itself with so useless and at bottom meaningless a problem as the priority of the parts of speech. It goes without saying that in the earliest period of language-formation there could not have been the slightest differentiation in word-functioning. Making use of Herder's favorite example, there is no reason to suppose that the remembered audible sensation "bleating" should originally have had more reference to the action of bleating than to the sheep itself. We shall probably be nearer the truth if we assume that the word made in imitation of bleating was employed to signify all that had reference to the remembered phenomenon. The word, which we may assume for the sake of argument to be "baa," might in modern terms signify "to bleat," "sheep," "wooly," or what not; only we must beware of imagining that "baa" had any clearly defined grammatical function. Herder speaks of the sheep as "ein *blöckendes* Geschöpf;" noting that *blöckend* is a verbal form, he concludes that the verb was the original part of speech.

Nature, Herder proceeds, appears to man as a resounding (*tönend*) whole; hence man infers that nature is animated, living, and personifies all the phenomena presented to his consciousness. By this peculiarly human tendency to vivify the inanimate and

[1] *Op. cit.*, pp. 52, 53. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 53.

relate to his own experience the vast sea of extra-human phenomena can be easily explained the most primitive religions, the grammatical category of sex-gender, which Herder, erroneously of course, seems to imagine is particularly widespread, and, above all, the genesis of poetry. For what was this earliest language, imitating the sounds of living nature and expressing ideas in vivid imagery, but poetry? Furthermore, this language was song, not learned, as Herder well shows, from the birds, but "song, that was as natural to him, as suited to his organs and natural impulses, as the nightingale's song to herself." "All nature sang and resounded, and the song of man was a concert of all these voices; in so far as his understanding needed them, his feeling grasped them, [and] his organs could give expression to them."[1] That the oldest song and poetry are derived from this primeval condition of identity of song and language Herder considers proved; he is inclined to look upon the Homeric poems as survivals from this earliest time; and even today the originally musical character of speech is attested by the accents of many savage idioms.

All of this enthusiastic speculation of Herder's on the singing-speech of primitive man—ideas which he had already developed in the earlier *Fragmente*—must now, of course, be taken with a grain of salt. That song and poetry are among the most natural forms of expression, and are found, inseparably linked, practically all over the world, is now fully recognized. Moreover, we have no difficulty in supposing that the earliest forms of language were more expressive emotionally than now; the human voice may, very possibly, have had a more decided pitch-modulation, have moved at greater musical intervals, than now, and thus have produced much of the effect of song. Even this, however, is mere speculation. But to suppose that the earliest speech was, in any true sense of the word, melodic song, from which the vocal art of the Greeks could be more or less directly derived, is to be considered the wildest and most improbable fancy. As to the finished art-works of Greece being survivals from Herder's hypothetical period of spontaneous poesy, *that* needs no comment here.

It is not difficult to understand how objects that have distinctive

[1] Herder, *op. cit.*, p. 58.

sound-attributes, such as a bleating sheep, can be symbolized by sound images. But how is it with phenomena that do not of themselves suggest suitable audible symbols? How are the impressions of sight and feeling, taste and smell, to be naturally expressed in terms of auditory impressions? Herder seeks the solution of this puzzling question in a psychologic truth, which one is somewhat surprised to see grasped so clearly in the eighteenth century. His remarks are so illuminating that I cannot do better than quote from them:

> What are these properties [i. e., of sight, hearing, etc.] in objects? They are merely sensed impressions *in us*, and as such do they not all flow into one another? We are one thinking *sensorium commune*, only affected on various sides—therein lies the explanation. Feeling underlies all senses, and this gives the most disparate sensations, so intimate, strong, indefinable a bond of union, that out of this combination the strangest appearances arise. There is more than one instance known to me of persons who, naturally, perhaps from some impression of childhood, could not do otherwise than directly combine by some rapid mutation [we should say "association" nowadays] this color with that sound with this appearance that entirely different, indefinite feeling, that, when viewed through the light of slow reason, has absolutely no connection therewith: for who can compare sound and color, appearance and feeling?[1]

From this now experimentally well-established psychologic law of an ever-present, at times indefinite but always real, undercurrent of feeling, accompanying and coloring the ever-flowing stream of sensation, Herder derives a somewhat nebulously stated corollary, an application of the law to the genesis of language. He declares:

> Since all senses, particularly in the condition of man's childhood, are nothing but forms of feeling of *one* mind; and since all feeling, according to an emotional law of animal nature, has directly its own vocal expression; therefore, if this feeling is heightened to the intensity of a characteristic mark (*Merkmal*), the *word* of external language is there.[2]

Furthermore:

> Since man receives the language of nature only by way of hearing, and without it cannot invent language, hearing has, in some manner, become the central one of his senses, the gate, as it were, to the mind, and the bond of union between the other senses.[3]

[1] *Op. cit.*, p. 61. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 64. [3] *Ibid.*, p. 64.

That the sense of hearing does really occupy so relatively important a place is, of course, at least questionable; but Herder, undismayed by disquieting doubts, proceeds to give six reasons for thinking so. First, hearing occupies a medial position among the senses in regard to range of impressivenesss (*Sphäre der Empfindbarkeit*); being richer than the tactile, and less overwhelming and distracting than the optic, sense. Thus it stands in the closest connection of any with the other senses, and is well adapted to serve as a transformer into linguistically usable images of the impressions conveyed through the medium of sight and touch. Secondly, hearing is a middle sense in the matter of clearness; the sense of touch gives too dull, undefined impressions, while the impressions of sight are too bright and manifold. Hearing effectively heightens the former, modifies the latter. Thirdly, hearing occupies a middle position as regards vividness (*Lebhaftigkeit*); feeling is too warm a sense, lodges itself too deeply and overpoweringly in one's consciousness, while visual impressions are too cold and leave one indifferent. The auditory sense is, then, for the whole mind, what the color green, as it were, is for the visual sense—neither too dull nor too intense. Fourthly, hearing is the middle sense in respect to the time in which it operates; tactile impressions are sudden and momentary; those of sight, on the other hand, confuse by their simultaneity. As opposed to these, auditory impressions generally take place in progression—not very much is offered at any one moment, but the flow of auditory sensation is fairly continuous. Fifthly, the images induced by the sense of hearing need outward expression. Impressions produced by feeling are too dark and self-centered to need such expression; the objects revealed by the sense of sight are generally permanent and can be indicated by gesture; "but the objects that appeal to hearing" Herder says, "are connected with motion: they slip by; but just on that account they give rise to sounds. They are capable of expression because they must be expressed, and because they must be expressed, because of their motion, they become capable of expression."[1] This quotation is a fair specimen of Herder's method of ratiocina-

[1] *Op. cit.*, p. 67.

tion at times. Sixthly and finally, hearing is the middle sense in point of order of development, feeling coming before and sight after. Thus Herder proves, apparently to his own entire satisfaction, that all the impressions of sense become capable of adequate linguistic expression by way of their close connection with the supposedly middle sense—that of hearing. Let us not bother with an unprofitable critique of Herder's antiquated and subjectively confused psychology, and consider it proved, for the sake of his argument, that all intense outward stimuli, no matter of what description, find their natural response in vocal expression.

Herder next proceeds to lay down a series of theses on the characteristics of "original" (*ursprünglichen*) languages, the purpose of which is to show how clearly the imprint of the human mind is visible in them. This to us is very axiomatic, but we should not forget that it was necessary for Herder to demonstrate it in order to disprove the orthodox theory of divine origin. The first of these *Sätze* reads: "The older and more original languages are, the more is this analogy of the senses noticeable in their roots."[1] Where we characterize in terms of sight or feeling, the oriental often prefers to have recourse to the sense of hearing. "Anger," for instance, is most commonly in later times thought of in terms of visual phenomena, such as blazing eyes and glowing cheeks; the oriental, however, finds its characteristic mark in the fierce snort of the nostrils.[2] Again, "life" is to most of us moderns best characterized by the pulse-beat, while the oriental *hears* in the living breath the most salient element of animated existence. And so on indefinitely.

Herder's second thesis reads: "The older and more original languages are, the more do the various shades of feeling cross each other in the roots of the words."[3] He proceeds:

> Let one open any oriental lexicon at random, and one will perceive the struggling desire to express ideas! How the inventor tore out ideas from one feeling and borrowed them for another! How he borrowed most of all from the most difficult, coldest, clearest senses! How every-

[1] *Op. cit.*, p. 70.

[2] Herder had in mind probably Heb. *'aph* "anger", dual *'appâyim* "nostrils."

[3] *Op. cit.*, p. 71.

thing had to be transformed into feeling and sound, in order to gain expression! Hence the strong, bold metaphors in the roots of words! Hence the extensions from feeling to feeling, so that the meanings of stem-words and, still more so, those of their derivatives, when put next to each other, present the most motley picture. The genetic cause lies in the poverty of the human mind and in the flowing together of the emotions of a primitive human being.[1]

The whole discussion of the metaphorical character of "original" languages is one of those wonderfully intuitive bits of insight that one meets with frequently enough in Herder's writings. He saw clearly the perfectly natural, and, indeed, psychologically inevitable, play of metaphor that runs through the history of language. This was remarkable at a time when figures of speech were thought to be the artistic flowers of polite literature. The modern semasiologist can, however, be bolder than Herder. He recognizes clearly that metaphor operates with equal power at all periods in the development of a language, not chiefly in the relatively older phases, as Herder thought, but just as well in times nearer the present. Moreover, he is inclined to believe that not merely a large part of the vocabulary of a language is metaphorically transferred in meaning, but that practically all of it has undergone an indefinite number of gradual semantic transmutations.

Herder's third thesis is as follows:

> The more original a language is, the more frequently do such feelings cross in it; the less easily can these be exactly and logically subordinated to one another. The language is rich in synonyms; alongside of real poverty it has the most unnecessary superfluity.[2]

How can so ill-arranged a mass of material be the work of God? As coming from the hand of man, however, the presence of synonyms is entirely explicable. Herder argues:

> The less acquainted one was with natural phenomena; the more aspects one could in inexperience observe therefrom and hardly recognize; the less one invented *à priori*, but rather according to circumstances of sense: the more synonyms.[3]

This great wealth of synonyms is seen not only in the proverbial two hundred words of the Arab for "snake" and about one

[1] *Op. cit.*, p. 71. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 75. [3] *Ibid.*, p. 76.

thousand for "sword," but also in most languages of primitive tribes. Herder points out that the latter, although often lacking terms for ideas which seem to us most necessary of expression, frequently possess an astonishing wealth of words for ideas but slightly differentiated in our own minds.

As fourth canon Herder enunciates the following:

> Just as the human mind can recall no abstraction out of the realm of spirits which it did not obtain by means of opportunities and awakenings of the senses, so also our language contains no abstract word which it has not obtained by means of tone and feeling. And the more original the language, the fewer abstractions, the more feelings.[1]

That all abstract ideas are originally expressed in terms of concrete images is almost self-evident, and Herder has, indeed, little difficulty in proving his point. Again he has recourse for his illustrations to the language of the Orient and of primitive peoples. "Holy" was, for instance, originally "set apart" in meaning; "soul" meant really "breath." Missionaries and travelers unanimously testify to the great difficulty of rendering abstract terms in the idioms of comparatively uncultured peoples; the history of civilization shows that many of the terms used in philosophy and other regions of abstract thought are simply borrowed from the vocabularies of nations already farther advanced in speculation. All this, Herder rightly emphasizes, points to the operation of purely human powers; no terms are found for abstractions not absolutely necessary to the thought of the people who use them, while in every case such terms are originally of purely sensational origin. Surely there can be no talk here of divine intervention, where only human weakness is manifest.

Herder's fifth and last thesis runs:

> Since every grammar is only a philosophy of language and a method of its use, it follows that the more original the language, the less grammar there must be in it, and the oldest [language] is simply the vocabulary of nature.[2]

Herder devotes several pages to a consideration of this matter, but his whole treatment seems now confused and antiquated. One acquainted with the elaborate formal machinery, particularly in

[1] *Op. cit.*, p. 78. [2] *Ibid.*, pp. 82, 83.

regard to the verb, of the Semitic and of many North American Indian languages, both of which Herder considered particularly "original" in character, will be inclined to deny point-blank the validity of his thesis. Herder, however, is not blind to this grammatical complexity. On the contrary, he asserts, paradoxically enough, that this very complexity is a sign of the lack of a true grammatical sense. He thinks that those languages that make use of complicated grammatical schemes show thereby their inability to arrange their material systematically and logically; the Germans or French, for instance, he implies, with fewer paradigms, have more of a grammar in the true sense of the word. Speaking more particularly of verb-forms, he says:

> The more conjugations [are found], the less thoroughly one has learned to systematize concepts relatively to each other. How many the orientals have! and yet they are not such in reality, for what transplantations and transferences of the verbs are there not from conjugation to conjugation! The matter is quite natural. Since nothing concerns man so much, at least appears to him so linguistically suitable, as that which he is to narrate: deeds, actions, events; therefore, such a multitude of deeds and events must originally have been gathered that a new verb arose for almost every condition.[1]

Herder's arguments do not, it is almost needless to observe, bear inspection. Herder thought of grammar, as was very natural in the eighteenth century, as something which was, with increasing civilization, brought to bear on language from without. With this conception in his mind, it seemed that to admit the existence of complex grammatical form in "original" languages was playing into the hands of Süssmilch. Today, however, owing to the vast stock of comparative and historic linguistic material at our disposal, we see clearly that grammar, so far from needing the loving attention of the grammarians, takes very good care of itself and develops along definite lines. We need not, therefore, deal in paradoxes and can admit, with a clear conscience, that many typically "original" languages, to adopt Herder's now unserviceable terminology, possess *truly* grammatical features of incredible complexity, as in the case of the Eskimo verb or Bantu noun.

[1] *Op. cit.*, p. 83.

Herder ends the first part of his prize essay with a paragraph which contains the following statement:

> Ich bilde mir ein, das Können der Empfindung menschlicher Sprache sei mit dem, was ich gesagt . . . . so bewiesen, dass wer dem Menschen nicht Vernunft abspricht, oder, was eben so viel ist, wer nur weiss, was Vernunft ist: wer sich ferner je um die Elemente der Sprache philosophisch bekümmert, ... der kann nicht einen Augenblick zweifeln, wenn ich auch weiter kein Wort mehr hinzusetze.[1]

And, indeed, Herder might have logically concluded the essay at this point, though we should not like to miss some of the thoughts in the second part. The form of the question as put by the academy, seemed, however, to Herder to demand an arrangement of his subject-matter into two distinct parts. Inasmuch as both of the queries posed are practically answered by Herder in the first part, we need not analyse in detail the trend of his argument in the second, which ostensibly discusses "auf welchem Wege der Mensch sich am füglichsten hat Sprache erfinden können und müssen," but which, in reality, deals chiefly with the gradual development of language. It is itself subdivided into four sections, each of these discussing a natural law operative in this development.

The first of these *Naturgesetze*, which Herder takes so seriously as to put in the imperative form, reads: "Man is a freely thinking, active being, whose powers work on progressively; therefore he shall be a creature of language (*Geschöpf der Sprache*)."[2] As the wording of this law implies, Herder here recapitulates, with amplifications, a good deal of what he had already presented in the first part. But there is a new thought introduced here—that of development in the line of progress. The gift of speech is, it is true, as characteristic of man as the ability to construct a hive is native to the bee—with this notable difference: the bee, acting mechanically by virtue of its inborn instinctive powers, builds as efficiently the first day as the last, and will build so, Herder believes, to the end of time; the language of man, however, increases in power and efficiency with every use that is made of it. The reason for this law of linguistic growth in the individual is evident when we consider the relation

[1] *Op. cit.*, p. 89. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 93.

between thought and language. "There is no condition of the human mind," Herder says, "which is not capable of linguistic expression or not really determined by words of the mind (*Worte der Seele*)."[1] Hence growth in the power of reflexion or *Besonnenheit*, conditioned by the growth of experience, entails also advance in the employment of language. "The growth of language," as Herder puts it, "is as natural to man as his nature itself."[2] Süssmilch had objected to the idea of a human development of language on the ground that such a proceeding would have required the thought of a philosophically trained mind, such as it would be utterly absurd to imagine primitive man to have been in possession of. Herder points out the shallowness of his argument in very emphatic terms—an argument that, lacking absolutely all sense of historical perspective, would picture primitive man as placed in the same environment and governed by the same conventions as prevailed in the pseudo-philosophical atmosphere of the eighteenth century. Herder gives a most excellent characterization of the spirit of his time in a few sentences which express his profound dissatisfaction with it:

Es ist für mich unbegreiflich, wie man sich so tief in die Schatten, in die dunklen Werkstätten des Kunstmässigen verlieren kann, ohne auch nicht ein mal das weite, helle Licht der uneingekerkerten Natur erkennen zu wollen . . . . Aus den Meisterstücken menschlicher Dichtkunst und Beredsamkeit [sind] Kindereien geworden, an welchen greise Kinder und junge Kinder Phrasen lernen und Regeln klauben. Wir haschen ihre Formalitäten und haben ihren Geist verloren; wir lernen ihre Sprache und fühlen nicht die lebendige Welt ihrer Gedanken. Derselbe Fall ist's mit unserm Urtheilen über das Meisterstück des menschlichen Geistes, die Bildung der Sprache überhaupt. Da soll uns das todte Nachdenken Dinge lehren, die bloss aus dem lebendigen Hauche der Welt, aus dem Geiste der grossen wirksamen Natur den Menschen beseelen, ihn aufrufen undfort bilden konnten. Da sollen die stumpfen, späten Gesetze der Grammatiker das Göttlichste sein, was wir verehren, und vergessen die wahre göttliche Sprachnatur, die sich in ihren Herzen mit dem menschlichen Geiste bildete, so unregelmässig sie auch scheine. Die Sprachbildung ist in die Schatten der Schule gewichen, aus denen sie nichts mehr für die lebendige Welt wirket: drum soll auch nie eine helle Welt gegeben sein, in der die ersten Sprachenbilder leben, fühlen, schaffen, und dichten mussten.[3]

[1] *Op. cit.*, p. 100. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 101. [3] *Ibid.*, pp. 111, 112.

Herder's second natural law carries the development of language one step farther; the first law dealt with the growth of language in the individual, the second is devoted to its development in the family. The law reads: "Man is, according to his nature, a being of the herd, of society: The development of a language is therefore natural, essential, necessary to him."[1] The great physical weakness of the human female as compared with the male, and the utter helplessness of the newborn child, make it absolutely necessary that human beings, even more so than is the case among the animals, form into families, sharing a common abode. The primitive man, more experienced than his mate and offspring, would naturally proceed to teach them that stock of linguistic information which he had himself so laboriously gathered. The child, entirely dependent as he is upon the exertions of his father, would babblingly repeat the sounds uttered in his neighborhood, and in time become inheritor of his parent's entire vocabulary. Arrived at maturity, he would go on enriching the store of linguistic knowledge on the basis of his own experience. In this way the institution of the family becomes an important means for the perpetuation from generation to generation and for the gradual enrichment of language. Moreover, in the very process of teaching, the language becomes more definitely organized, the stock of ideas becomes more and more clearly defined; Herder, indeed, sees in this earliest process of language-instruction the genesis of grammar.

The most interesting portion of the second part of Herder's essay is the discussion of the third natural law, dealing with the rise of nationally distinct languages. Herder formulates his law thus: "Just as the whole race of man could not possibly remain *one* herd, so also it could not retain *one* language. There arises consequently the formation of various national tongues."[2] Herder begins his discussion by clearly pointing out that, in the exact or, as he terms it, "metaphysical" sense of the word, no two persons speak precisely the same language, any more than they are exact physical counterparts. Setting aside, however, such minute individual differences, it can easily be shown that more distinctly

[1] *Op. cit.*, p. 112.

[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 123, 124.

marked linguistic groups or dialects would, in the nature of things, form. Every family-group puts its own characteristic stamp upon the inherited linguistic stock; differences of climate work upon the speech-organs, and consequently, Herder supposes, upon the language itself;[1] the preference for different words and turns of expression in different sections of the linguistic field gives rise to dialects. "Original" languages, moreover, being less hampered, according to Herder, by grammatical rules, are more liable to dialectic disintegration than more cultured idioms; although here, too, the most careful modern linguistic research does not unconditionally bear out Herder's presumption. The oft-asserted and oft-repeated statement of the incredibly rapid change of the languages of primitive tribes is founded chiefly on the untrustworthy reports of linguistically inefficient missionaries; many of the extreme statements formerly and even yet current are absurdly untrue. Indeed, the most startling cases of linguistic conservatism are found among certain primitive peoples, such as the Eskimos.

Man, Herder proceeds, with an almost naïve anthropomorphic teleology, is made for all the earth and all the earth for man. Hence we find him at home as well in the regions of eternal snow as under the burning sun of the tropics. As is to be expected, under widely diverse geographical and climatic conditions, the originally homogeneous race of man differentiates into diverse races, while the originally homogeneous speech of man differentiates first into dialects, then, with the lapse of ages, into mutually quite unintelligible languages. Hence is to be explained the bewildering Babel of tongues; as Herder expresses it: "Die Sprache wird ein Proteus auf der runden Oberfläche der Erde."[2] It is to be borne in mind, of course, that the now familiar conception of independent linguistic stocks was in the main a foreign one to Herder; it did not arise until after a lucky fate discovered the relationship of the idiom of ancient India with that of far-distant Greece and Rome. If Herder's view of the gradual

[1] It should be stated here, however, that, contrary to all expectation, anatomical investigation has never succeeded in demonstrating differences of vocal anatomy to be the basis of differences in dialect or language.

[2] *Op. cit.*, p. 127.

differentiation of speech is correct, we expect to find linguistic modifications congruent to geographic differences. How comes it, then, that totally diverse languages are often found spoken side by side? Herder thinks to be able satisfactorily to explain this puzzling condition by the hatred with which neighboring tribes frequently regard each other. Such discord would operate quite as effectively as geographical barriers toward linguistic isolation. The description of the confusion of tongues in Genesis Herder interprets as a characteristically oriental method of presenting this truth.

The fourth and last *Naturgesetz* reads:

> Just as, according to all probability, the human race forms a progressive whole from one origin in one great system; so also all languages, and with them the whole chain of culture.[1]

After a brief résumé of the links in the chain of linguistic development—development in the individual, in the family, and in the nation—Herder most emphatically supports a monogenistic view of language as the most rational. His chief reason for the contention is the evident similarity he finds in the grammatical structure of the various languages—a similarity that he believes to be so great as to preclude all possibility of polygenism. The only serious departure from the common grammatical outlines is found, according to Herder, in the case of Chinese, which however, is but an exception. Herder advances as another argument in favor of linguistic monogenism the almost universal use of the same or very similar alphabets. This universality was more apparent in Herder's time than now, for the Egyptian and various cuneiform records had not as yet been deciphered. Still one is rather surprised to find a man of Herder's stamp so lose sight of the perspective of history as to present so lame an argument. One might have expected him to perceive that in any case the formation of written alphabets must have taken place long after independent languages had developed, and that the wide spread of the so-called Phœnician alphabet was due to several stages of borrowing, to a great extent, within historic times.

The latter part of the essay rapidly summarizes the orthodox

[1] *Op. cit.*, p. 134.

stand taken by Süssmilch and his followers as against the more philosophical and psychologically sounder view of Herder concerning the origin of language. Herder makes bold to call the orthodox view "nonsense" (*Unsinn*), and accuses its supporters of petty anthropomorphism in their conception of God's activity. On the other hand, he claims:

> Der menschliche [Ursprung] zeigt Gott im grössesten Lichte; sein Werk, eine menschliche Seele, durch sich selbst, eine Sprache schaffend und fortschaffend, weil sie sein Werk, eine menschliche Seele ist.[1]

At the very end of the essay we find Herder's own statement of his aim, with which I shall close my analysis of his work as a perfectly good formulation of the spirit to be pursued in investigations of such a character even today:

> Er [i. e., der Verfasser] befliss sich feste Data aus der menschlichen Seele, der menschlichen Organisation, dem Bau aller alten und wilden Sprachen, und der ganzen Haushaltung des menschlichen Geschlechts zu sammlen, und seinen Satz so zu beweisen, wie die festeste philosophische Wahrheit bewiesen werden kann.[2]

It is hardly necesssary to go into any *general* criticism on Herder's prize essay, particularly as various points in Herder's argument have been the subject of critical comment in the course of our analysis. That much of the work is quite antiquated, both in subject-matter and general attitude, is, of course, self-evident; it is rather to be wondered at how much in the essay is still valid, and with what remarkable intuitive power Herder grasped some of the most vital points both in psychology and language. One wishes that we today could be so cocksure of the solution of certain linguistic problems as Herder seems to have been; but, then, that was characteristic in a large measure of the age of rationalism. The philosophers of the eighteenth century, relying very heavily on pure reason unfettered by hard facts, proceeded, with admirable courage, to attack and solve the most obscure and intricate problems in the history of human culture—problems to the solution of which we have now learned to proceed quite timidly. Some of this blind trust in pure reason is apparent in our prize essay; yet Herder attempted, as much as possible, to make use of what linguistic material was at hand in the verification of his theories.

[1] *Op. cit.*, p. 146. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 147.

It is not necessary, either, to go into any analysis of the literary style of Herder's essay, as the important thing in our subject is not Herder's language, but rather his thought. The characteristic qualities of Herder's style are here in evidence as elsewhere; wealth of figurative expression; a lavish use of rhetorical periods, as outwardly indicated by a generous sprinkling of exclamation points, interrogation points, and dashes (it may be noted that the treatise ends with a dash); and a warm, enthusiastic diction, which often carries the author away from the immediate object of discussion. In general, however, the essay is remarkable, at least when considered as a Herder document, for the systematic development of the theme and for clearness of exposition.

It is certainly very strange, and almost incredible, that one who succeeded so well in demonstrating the human origin of language should himself have later been in doubt as to the validity of his conclusions; yet such was the melancholy case with Herder. When Herder wrote the prize essay, during the latter part of his stay in Strassburg (1770), he was still, in the main, in sympathy with the rationalistic advocates of reason, even though the bloodless *Aufklärung* of a Nicolai was not exactly to his taste. Hence we find in the essay a strong aversion for the mystic and supernatural, and a desire to explain all cultural phenomena in the light of human intelligence. In the early part of his Bückeburg residence, however, Herder's ideas underwent a tremendous change. So radical, indeed, was the transformation effected in his general mental attitude that the *Preisschrift* may be conveniently considered as marking the end of a definitely limited period in Herder's life. The mental change referred to was a break with the older standpoint of "enlightenment" (*Aufklärung*), which had on the whole, despite Hamann's influence, dominated Herder's thoughts, if at times equivocally. He now (1771–72), very largely under the influence of the mystically pious Countess of Bückeburg, leaned toward romanticism, and a philosophy and theology that did not seek the final explanation of things in reason. Hence, when the news reached Herder that he had been awarded the prize, he was anything but elated; the

whole spirit and tendency of his essay were now quite distasteful to him, and belonged already for Herder to the dim past. Despite the change in Herder, congratulations on the winning of the prize came in from all sides; "the townspeople," he writes, "regard me as the most celebrated of men because I have now gained the prize."[1] These congratulations, as might well be expected under the circumstances, brought Herder more vexation than satisfaction.

At Easter of the year 1772, Herder's former preceptor, Hamann, who had not corresponded with his disciple since the latter had left Riga, and from whom Herder had in the meanwhile become somewhat estranged, intellectually speaking, wrote a cold and hostile review of the *Ursprung der Sprache* in the *Königsberger Journal.* Though many ideas developed in the essay had been largely inspired by suggestions of Hamann himself, nevertheless Herder's flat denial of the direct agency of God in the invention of language was by no means to the other's taste. The stand taken by Hamann is well summarized by Nevinson: "God might act through nature and the voices of beasts, but from God language, as all else, must come, for in God we live and move and have our being."[2] Herder felt the sting of criticism all the more keenly in that he was now largely in sympathy with Hamann's views, and felt drawn toward his former teacher more powerfully than ever. Through the mediation of their mutual friend, Hartknoch, a reconciliation was effected between the two, Herder recanting the heresies of which he had been guilty. In a second and more favorable review, and in a treatise entitled *The Last Words of the Red-Cross Knight on the Divine or Human Origin of Language*, Hamann clearly shows that the friends of old were friends again. Perhaps nothing can prove more clearly the unhealthy element in the mysticism of Herder's Bückeburg period than his amazing repudiation of the doctrines he had himself so unanswerably demonstrated. For a time he occupied himself with the thought of adding some words of explanation and semi-apology to the essay, published by authority of the Academy in 1772, but nothing came of the plan. Fritz Mauthner,

[1] See Nevinson, *Herder and His Times*, p. 185.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 196.

in the work already referred to, speaks impatiently of Herder's inconstancy:

> Herder bringt sich um jeden Kredit, wenn er seine Preisschrift schon 1772 (in einem Brief an Hamann) als "Schrift eines Witztölpels" verleugnet; die Denkart dieser Preisschrift könne und solle auf ihn so wenig Einfluss haben, als das Bild, das er jetzt an die Wand nagle. Da ist es denn kein Wunder, wenn Herder in der Folgezeit den lieben Gott wieder um die Erfindung der Sprache bemüht.[1]

Certainly disingenuous is Herder's statement, in the long letter of explanation addressed to Hamann, that after all he had not seriously differed from his preceptor, and that in writing for "an enlightened royal Prussian Academy"[2] he had been forced to put on the mask of the "Leibnitzian æsthetic form."[3] After Herder had freed himself from the mists of Bückeburg mysticism, a reversal in judgment set in in favor of his earlier comparatively rationalistic views, so that, when seventeen years later, in 1788–89, he prepared a second edition of the *Preisschrift*, he found little to change in the text, save in the matter of chastening the wildness of the language. We may then safely look upon our *Preisschrift* as the most important and genuine expression of Herder's views upon the subject of language.

Concerning the influence of Herder's prize essay on subsequent linguistic speculation it is difficult to speak definitely, from the very nature of Herder's work. Herder did not, as we have seen, definitely systematize, nor could his solution of the problem be considered in any way final; his own subsequent vacillation shows, perhaps more clearly than anything else, the unsatisfactory nature of much of the reasoning. Contradictions even of no small significance and lack of clearness in the terms used will have been noticed in the course of our exposition of Herder's essay; the weak points in it, both when judged from the standpoint of Herder's own time and from that of the post-Humboldtian and pre-evolutionary view-point of the sixties, are probably best pointed out by the psychologist and linguistic philosopher, H. Steinthal, in his *Ursprung der Sprache*. Setting aside faults in the essay itself, it is evident that the new vistas of

[1] F. Mauthner, "Zur Sprachwissenschaft" (Vol. II of *Kritik der Sprache*), pp. 47–50.

[2] See Nevinson, *op. cit.*, p. 197. [3] *Ibid.*

linguistic thought opened up by the work of Karl Wilhelm von Humboldt, and the more special labors of Bopp and Grimm, speedily relegated Herder's treatise to the limbo of things that were, so that even as early as the period at which Steinthal and Grimm wrote their works on the origin of language, Herder's *Preisschrift* had already become of chiefly historical interest. The real historic significance, then, of Herder's work would be shown to lie in the general service it rendered by compelling a sounder study of the psychologic and historic elements involved in the investigation of the problem, and perhaps also in the suggestions it gave Humboldt for his far deeper treatment of the same and closely allied themes.

Perhaps the best testimony which could be offered on the subject of Herder's more general influence is the following quotation from Jacob Grimm at the close of his own work on the origin of language:

> Enden kann ich nicht, ohne vorher dem Genius des Mannes zu huldigen, der was ihm an Tiefe der Forschung oder Strenge der Gelehrsamkeit abging, durch sinnvollen Tact, durch reges Gefühl der Wahrheit ersetzend, wie manche andere, auch die schwierige Frage nach der Sprache Ursprung bereits so erledigt hatte, dass seine ertheilte Antwort immer noch zutreffend bleibt, when sie gleich mit anderen Gründen, als ihm schon dafür zu Gebote standen, aufzustellen und bestätigen ist.[1]

On his immediate contemporaries the prize essay doubtless made a deep impression. To Goethe, who was just at that time under Herder's personal influence, the author showed the essay while still in manuscript. Goethe had not thought very much about the subject, and was inclined to consider it as somewhat superfluous. "For," he says, "if man was of divine origin, so was language; and, if man must be regarded in the circle of nature, language must also be natural. Still, I read the treatise with great pleasure and to my special edification."[2]

The extent and even existence of Herder's influence on Humboldt, on the other hand, is a disputed question. It is all the more important because practically all the later thought on the philosophy of language (Steinthal, Schleicher, and others) is

[1] Jacob Grimm, *Über den Ursprung der Sprache* (Berlin, 1852), p. 56.

[2] See Nevinson, *op. cit.*, p. 163.

connected quite directly with Humboldt's ideas developed in his *Über das vergleichende Sprachstudium in Beziehung auf die verschiedenen Epochen der Sprachentwickelung*, and still more in the *Einleitung in die Kawisprache: über die Verschiedenheit des menschlichen Sprachbaues und ihren Einfluss auf die geistige Entwickelung der Menschengeschichte.* Steinthal, himself an enthusiastic follower and developer of Humboldtian views, most emphatically denies any indebtedness on Humboldt's part to Herder.[1]

Haym, Herder's biographer, on the other hand, just as emphatically asserts the perceptible influence of Herder in Humboldt's writings, and claims that the latter is most decidedly to be considered as standing on his predecessor's shoulders. He says:

> Er [i. e., Humboldt] wiederholt die Gedanken Herder's — er vertieft, er verfeinert, er bestimmt, er klärt sie, er denkt das von jenem gleichsam athemlos Gedachte mit ruhig verweilender Umsicht zum zweiten Male nach und durch.[2]

He goes on to show how, as with Herder, so also with Humboldt, man is "ein singendes Geschöpf, aber Gedanken mit den Tönen verbindend";[3] language is to Humboldt very much as to Herder, "die natürliche Entwickelung einer den Menschen als solchen bezeichnenden Anlage."[4] To Humboldt the chief task of general linguistics is the consideration from a single point of view of the apparently infinite variety of languages, "und durch alle Umwandlnngen der Geschichte hindurch dem Gange der geistigen Entwickelung der Menschheit an der Hand der tief in dieselbe verschlungenen, sie von Stufe zu Stufe begleitenden Sprache zu folgen."[5] This is evidently little else than a more satisfactory and scientific formulation of Herder's idea of the gradual growth of language in concomitance with the growth of *Besonnenheit.* On the whole, I should be inclined, in view of the greater probability of the historic continuity of ideas, to side with Haym. A comprehensive statement of the position that Herder occupies in the history of linguistics is given by Lauchert.[6]

[1] H. Steinthal, *Der Ursprung der Sprache* (Berlin, 1858), p. 12.

[2] Haym, *Herder nach seinem Leben und seinen Werken dargestellt*, p. 408.

[3] *Ibid.* [4] *Ibid.* [5] *Ibid.*

[6] F. Lauchert, "Die Anschauungen Herders über den Ursprung der Sprache," *Euphorion*, Vol. I, p. 766.

Es genüge, darauf hingewiesen zu haben, dass die neuere Sprachphilosophie, soweit sie einerseits nicht auf dem Boden des positiven Christentums und der Schöpfungslehre desselben steht, andrerseits aber auch noch nicht auf dem der modernen naturalistisch-materialistischen Weltanschauung, direkt oder indirekt unter Herder's Einfluss steht.

As the last general linguist to discuss language problems from the standpoint that maintained the existence of a wide, impassable gulf between man and the lower animals, and stoutly denied any genetic relationship between animal cries and the rude beginnings of human speech, should perhaps be mentioned Max Müller. Like Herder and Humboldt, he saw in language the distinguishing mark that separated man from the brute world, and was never tired, to the end of his days, of arguing that this possession of language was the death-blow to Darwinism. The idea of the interrelation of language and reason, and of their simultaneous growth, common to Herder and Humboldt, we find pushed to its utmost limit by Max Müller. So impressed was he by this theory of the essential identity of language and reason that his slogan in later days was: "Without reason no language; without language no reason."[1] As is well known, his assertion of this principle brought on a fruitless logomachy with William Dwight Whitney. Despite Max Müller, however, it seems to me that the path for future work on the prime problems, more especially the origin, of language lies in the direction pointed out by evolution. A new element, the careful and scientific study of sound-reflexes in higher animals, must now enter into the discussion. Perhaps this, with a very extended study of *all* the various existing stocks of languages, in order to determine the most *fundamental* properties of language, may assist materially in ultimately rendering our problem more tractable. We should not only try to imagine to what beginnings the present state of language reaches back, but also to reconstruct an ideal picture of the evolution of howls and cries, under the favoring conditions, whatever those were, into less rude forms of audible expression. Perhaps the ends of the two series can be bridged over?

EDWARD SAPIR

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

[1] See, e. g., title-page of M. Müller's *Science of Thought* (New York, 1887).

A FEW PARALLELS FROM THE CLASSICS

SHAKESPERE AND SENECA

That Shakespere was acquainted with Seneca is a priori probable and approaches nearer to proof with every new parallel or coincidence noted. "And earthly power doth then show likest God's," etc., has been recently discovered in *De clementia*, iii–v. Hardly less plausible is the parallel which I have observed between the speech of Constance in *King John*, Act III, scene iv, and a passage of the *Consolatio ad Marciam*, 1, 5. Constance says:

> Grief fills the room up of my absent child,
> Lies in his bed, walks up and down with me,
> . . . . . .
> Then, have I reason to be fond of grief.

With a precisely similar conceit Seneca writes: *teneas licet et amplexeris dolorem tuum, quem tibi in filii locum superstitem fecisti.* Similarly Lucan, *Pharsalia*, ix, 112, *et amat pro conjuge luctum.* Shakespere has merely expanded the fancy with Elizabethan exuberance.

MILTON AND CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA

Milton's "bright countenance of Truth" (*The Reason of Church Government*) has become a familiar quotation. It is a translation of *ἀληθείας δὲ ὑμῖν τὸ πρόσωπον τὸ φαιδρὸν* in the second paragraph of the *Protrepticus* of Clement of Alexandria.

DANIEL AND SENECA

Daniel's well-worn,

> unless above himself he can
> Erect himself, how poor a thing is man,

seems to be a translation of *O quam res est contempta homo, nisi supra humana surrexerit*, in the *Prologus* to Seneca's "Natural Questions." The lines quoted by Lowell ("Democracy") from "Musophilus,"

> That few is all the world, which *with a few*
> Doth ever *live* and move and work and strive,

are obviously suggested by Lucan's "Humanum *paucis vivit* genus" (*Pharsalia*, v, 343).

Lucan is out of favor now, but has been much read in the past. For example, the lines in Jonson's *Sejanus*, II, 2,

> As if there were that chaos bred in things,
> That laws and liberty would not rather choose
> To be quite broken and ta'en hence by us
> Than have the stain to be preserved by such,

are obviously a paraphrase of

> non usque adeo permiscuit imis
> Longus summa dies, ut non si voce Metelli
> Serventur leges, malint a Caesare tolli.

Symonds selects for special praise in the "Misfortunes of Arthur" the vigorous lines:

> Yea though I conqueror die and full of fame,
> Yet let my death and parture rest obscure.
> No grave I need, O fates, nor burial rites,
> Nor stately hearse, nor tomb with haughty top;
> But let my carcase lurk; yea let my death
> Be aye unknown so that in every coast
> I still be feared and looked for every hour.

He fails to observe that they are a translation of Lucan, *Pharsalia*, v, 668 ff.

> mihi funere nullo
> est opus, o superi: lacerum retinete cadaver
> Fluctibus in mediis: desint mihi busta rogusque.
> Dum metuar semper, terraque exspecter ab omni.

These are but a few casual illustrations of how what we disparagingly dub "Silver Latinity" has been unsuspectingly accepted as golden English.

PAUL SHOREY

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Modern Philology

Vol. V *October, 1907* No. 2

THE SOURCE OF KEATS'S "EVE OF ST. AGNES"

Two elements of the story of Keats's *Eve of St. Agnes* have been criticized. These are the introductory scene of the "ancient bedesman,"[1] and the preparation of the feast by Porphyro in Madeline's chamber.[2] The theory that these two beautiful adornments of the story were the result of the poet's inclination to digression and to excess of rare description, as well as of his weakness in plot-construction, is strengthened by the fact that the first seven stanzas of the poem, containing all the account of the bedesman and his chapel, are not present in the Woodbridge MS of the poet's first draft of the poem;[3] while it was the stanzas describing the dainties which Keats selected with peculiar pleasure to read aloud to his host Leigh Hunt.[4] These two elements, then, are

[1] The ancient bedesman "has personally nothing whatever to do with the tale; he provides contrast to the revelry, which he introduces by hearing it, and he gives also opportunity for describing his haunt in the chapel of the heroine's castle; but the chapel is never used again."—Robert Bridges, *John Keats* (1895, etc.), p. 49.

[2] "Why he [Porphyro] did this no critic and no admirer has yet been able to divine; and the incident is so trivial in itself, and is made so much of for the purpose of verbal or metrical embellishment, as to reinforce our persuasion that Keats's capacity for framing a story out of successive details of a suggestive and self-consistent kind was decidedly feeble."—W. M. Rossetti, *Life of Keats* (1887), p. 183.

Mr. Palgrave ("Golden Treasury" series, 1901, p. 276) attempted to excuse this latter error of judgment by pointing out that the supper-picture was intended as a poetical contrast to the previous fasting of Madeline. A MS note in the Harvard Library copy of Bridges' *Essay* noted above states that in some versions of the St. Agnes superstitions "the maiden was told she would feast with her lover in her dreams." I have not attempted to verify this doubtful statement, for neither excuse is valid as justifying the supper-picture from the point of view of the plot-construction alone, however beautiful in itself.

[3] See *Keats* in the "English Men of Letters" series, by Sidney Colvin, Appendix, p. 229.

[4] See Palgrave's note, *loc. cit.* A similar embellishment is that of the trading-ventures of Isabella's brothers in *Isabella*, which we know was an addition to the poet's source.

probably later decorations of the story, added for purposes of embellishment, and for this reason not woven into the plot of *St. Agnes Eve.*

If, however, we dismiss these two parts of the poem's machinery, we find the rest of the story remarkably well knit, succinct, and lifelike, and quite undeserving Rossetti's censure of "this extreme tenuity of constructive power in the poem." Mr. Rossetti's summary is so little detailed[1] that I must ask patience in presenting my own summary of the main action of this famous poem.[2]

It is evening in an ancient castle. Madeline, a lovesick maiden, has been told how maidens on St. Agnes Eve, by fasting from supper, keeping the eyes turned upward and sleeping on the back, shall see their lovers in their visions. She longs to put this to the test, and, amid the gay crowd of revelers at the castle, she sighs anxiously. Meanwhile her lover, Porphyro, has come across the moors in the moonlight for his love. He ventures in, observed only by Angela, an old dame, who warns him that he is among enemies. She leads him for safety into a little room, where he eagerly inquires for Madeline. Angela tells him how the girl proposes to try the charms of St. Agnes that night. At this an idea comes to him, and he whispers his plan. The old woman takes umbrage at his words, but Porphyro swears he will not harm the girl, and at last persuades the old woman to show him into a closet adjoining Madeline's bed-chamber. Hardly is he safely bestowed when Madeline enters; her taper is extinguished, but the moonlight floods the room, colored by the stained-glass casement-window, in glorious colors falling on the girl. She undresses, and "pensive awhile she dreams awake." At length her wakeful swoon is dispelled, and she sleeps from fatigue. The lover comes out of his hiding-place, and gazes enraptured upon the girl, and (having made some preparations) bids her awake, lest he drowse beside her. He does so awhile, musing and gazing on his lady. At last, play-

[1] "The story of this fascinating poem is so meager as to be almost nugatory. There is nothing in it but this, that Keats took hold of the superstition proper to St. Agnes Eve, the power of a maiden to see her absent lover under certain conditions, and added to it that a lover, who was clandestinely present in this conjuncture of circumstances, eloped with his mistress."—Rossetti, *loc. cit.* This statement is quite unsatisfactory.

[2] Omitting, of course, the two elements already considered.

ing an ancient melody close to the girl's ear, he awakens her. She stares at him affrightedly, but he sinks on his knee. She mistakes him for the substance of her dream, "the vision of her sleep," and moans forth words to her dream-Porphyro, begging him not to leave her. Enraptured at these words of love, he "melts into her dream," and the lovers spend the night together. A storm rises ere morning, and, urged by her lover, his "bride" Madeline escapes with him across the moors.

Here is a detailed story, with a considerable number of happy turns, narrated in thirty-five stanzas loaded with masses of rich description and metaphor. To achieve such compactness is certainly no little feat for a poet of Keats's digressive inclinations. It is quite at variance with the rambling discursiveness of *Endymion*. *Isabella*, practically the same length as *St. Agnes Eve*, is closely modeled on an older story. The amount of constructive imagination needed to build this tale from the St. Agnes superstition seems beyond anything yet shown by Keats in original work.

We may gain some help in seeking an explanation of this fact from Keats himself. In a letter of date October 18, 1818, four months before our poem was written, Keats says: "I have written independently, without judgment: I may write independently, with judgment, hereafter." These words, à propos of what he himself called the "slipshod" *Endymion*, seem to indicate that the poet proposed to model his work more carefully thereafter, using "judgment"—that is, the standards of other poets. A second hint is found in the poem itself. May not the poem be made up of

> shadows haunting fairily
> The brain, new stuff'd in youth, with triumphs gay
> Of old romance?

That Keats was at this period interested in old romance is shown by his poem *Isabella or the Pot of Basil*, a rendering of one of the novels of the *Decameron* of Boccaccio. Keats probably read this story in the Italian prose of the original. He had expressed his admiration for the Italian language as opposed to the French in a letter to Fanny Keats, September 10, 1817. His intention to learn Italian is expressed in a letter to J. H. Reynolds,

April 27, 1818. In a letter to John Taylor, September 5, 1819, he says he is "revising *St. Agnes Eve* and studying Italian."

But more than all this is the evidence furnished by Reynolds, who tells us that Keats and he had planned a series of poetical tales from Boccaccio, of which *Isabella* was written as the first.[1] He himself wrote two such tales. It is certain, then, that Keats was during the year 1818 highly interested in romance, and in Boccaccio in particular. It is scarcely possible that so enthusiastic a reader as Keats would content himself with the *Decameron* alone. He would almost certainly dip into some of the prose romances of the entertaining Italian.

All this prepares us to give due weight to the significant parallel here drawn between Keats's story, as outlined above, and the most famous scene in the prose romance *Filocolo*, by Boccaccio; the scene in the tower at Alexandria. That this episode, one of the few bright spots in a long and dull narrative, was in itself attractive enough to arrest the attention of a narrative poet is evident from Chaucer's use of it in *Troilus and Criseyde*.[2]

An outline of the episode in the tower at Alexandria[3] will show the likeness at once. I quote mainly from Mr. Young's summary.

The enamored Florio, under his new name, Filocolo, has followed Biancofiore to Alexandria. Having ingratiated himself with Sadoc, the guardian of the tower in which Biancofiore with her attendant, Glorizia, is confined, Florio arranges to be conveyed into the tower by concealing himself in a basket of flowers. On the appointed day, a gala-day, Florio gets into the tower, and when he is deposited in one of the rooms in the tower, he at once demands of Glorizia to be led to Biancofiore. Glorizia explains to him that he cannot immediately see her, on account of the dangers from scandal and too sudden joy to the lady. Therefore Glorizia arranges to conceal Florio in an adjoining chamber, from

[1] Keats's works, ed. H. B. Forman, Vol. II, p. 43 (ed. 1883). The preface to Reynolds' volume, *The Garden of Florence*, is there quoted. "The stories from Boccaccio (*The Garden of Florence* and *The Ladye of Provence*) were to have been associated with tales from the same source intended to have been written by a friend," etc.

[2] This point was established by Mr. Karl Young in an article published in *Modern Philology* for July, 1906. Scholars are indebted to Mr. Young for calling attention to this important work.

[3] Libro IV, Vol. VIII (Moutier, Firenze, 1829), pp. 165–83.

which he can observe Biancofiore and her attendants in their merry-making, and promises later to conduct him from the side-chamber and conceal him behind the curtains of Biancofiore's bed, where he must await his lady's going to sleep before revealing himself. Glorizia warns him that Biancofiore will be severely frightened when she wakes, but that her fear will soon give way to joy. Glorizia then tries to arouse the melancholy Biancofiore, sighing in the midst of the festivities, to take part in the celebration of the day, and comforts her by recounting a dream in which she saw Florio appear in Biancofiore's chamber, while Biancofiore was asleep in her bed, and that she woke and made great joy. Thus comforted, the girl and her maids celebrate the day with flowers and music, though Biancofiore often heaves great sighs; Florio looks on through a little hole from the adjoining chamber. At night Glorizia arranges Biancofiore's bed and conceals Florio behind the curtains. While Biancofiore prepares for bed, Glorizia arouses her feelings for Florio by suggesting now the possibility, and again the impossibility, of his coming. Glorizia goes so far as to hint that some other man might please her—a suggestion indignantly repudiated. When Glorizia leaves her, Biancofiore lies down, but only after she is exhausted by sighs for Florio does she give herself up to sleep. Florio advances and caresses her as she sleeps, and gazes with impassioned love upon her. The room is filled with magic light as bright as day, from two magic carbuncles. Florio addresses the girl in loving words, bidding her wake and enjoy her love. Biancofiore, however, does not awake until Florio clasps her in his arms. When she wakes she mistakes him at first for the Florio about whom she is that very moment dreaming, and so remains half-asleep. Growing more awake, she cries out to her dream Florio: "Who takes thee from me?" Florio at last convinces her of his identity, and, after a ring is given and vows interchanged, the lovers retire and spend the night together.

A comparison of these summaries shows that the following story is common to both:

A maiden, longing for her lover, and sighing in the midst of others' joy on a feast day, is prepared for the coming of her lover

by being told of dreams in which her lover appears in her bedchamber while she is asleep in bed. She pays no heed to the music and festivities of friends, but sighs continually.[1] The lover gets into her castle (the *torre* of Boccaccio contains a hundred rooms) with danger to himself, unobserved by all save an old woman, friendly to the lovers. (Glorizia is addressed as *madre* by Biancofiore, p. 159, etc.) The lover at once demands the whereabouts of his lady. A plan is arranged between the two, that the lover shall be hidden in the room of the maiden, while she comes in, undresses, and goes to sleep. The lover must not harm the girl. The girl comes into her room, undresses,[2] and gets into bed, the lover looking on from his place of concealment. The room is lighted by strange light, so that the lover may see the beauties of his love.[3] The girl, wakeful at first, finally sleeps from fatigue.[4] The lover comes from his place of hiding, views his love asleep, and, sinking beside her on the bed, in words of love bids her awake. This she does not do. Under stronger measures[5] the maiden wakes, at the very moment when she is dreaming about her lover. She mistakes her lover for the lover of her dream,[6] and addresses him in sad words, begging him not to leave her. The lover finally succeeds in waking her, and the

[1] *St. Agnes:*
vii, She sigh'd for Agnes' dreams.
viii. She sighs
Amid the timbrels.

Filocolo, p. 169: "Biancofiore . . . . piena di malincolia, etc.
P. 172: . . . . con quelle . . . . sonando con usata mano dolce strumenti . . . . ,Biancofiore . . . . gittando spesso grandissimi sospiri, etc.

[2] In both works detail of the undressing is given, and the girl loiters over it.

St. Agnes, xxvi:
. . . . Unclasps her warmed jewels one by one,
. . . . . .
Pensive awhile she dreams awake.

Filocolo, p. 174: Biancofiore e Glorizia se ne vennero nella camera per dormirsi; . . . . e Biancofiore che una cintoletta di Florio aveva, quella tenendo in mano, altro che baciarla non faceva, e in questa maniera dimorando . . . .

[3] Red light in both: "warm gules" in *St. Agnes;* the light from carbuncles in *Filocolo.*

[4] *St. A.*, xxvii: And soul fatigued away.

Filocolo, p. 177: . . . . Con fatica dopo molti sospiri s' adormentò.

[5] It is much to Keats's credit that he substitutes here for Boccaccio's debased picture, the poetic device of the lute playing.

[6] *St. A.*, xxxiv.
Her eyes were open, but she still beheld
Now wide awake, the vision of her sleep, etc.

Filocolo, p. 179. Ma l' anima che nel sonno le pareva nelle di colui stare, nelle cui il corpo veramente dimorava, non la lasciava dal sonno sviluppare, parendole in non minore allegrezza essere che paresse a Filocolo che lei teneva. Alla fine . . . . tutta stupefatta si destò, dicendo, oimè, anima mia, chi mi ti toglie? etc.

lovers spend the night together. The love is made an honest thing by the vows and ring in one case, by the term "my bride" in the other.

The elopement of the lovers in *St. Agnes Eve* is not in *Filocolo*, though the romance too has a happy ending. Keats wisely changed the story at this point to make the episode a complete unit. The scene in *Filocolo* is an episode in a long story. Save for one other point—namely, the connection of this story of a lover coming to a dreaming girl, with the St. Agnes superstition —one could hardly find a closer parallel.[1] And, in view of the insistence upon the element of the girl's dream in the *Filocolo*, and the preparation for the dream by Glorizia's narrative of a similar dream, it is not difficult to surmise what has happened; either Keats, intending to write a story of St. Agnes Eve, remembered the *Filocolo* story which he had recently read, on account of its dream-machinery; or else, intending to tell a version of the *Filocolo* scene, with its splendid opportunities for the display of his descriptive gift and his warm feeling for romance, he was reminded of the St. Agnes rites by the same dream-machinery, and, having looked up the superstition,[2] joined it to the story. That Keats was not averse to improving on his source is shown by his addition to the trading ventures of Isabella's brothers, for descriptive purposes, in *Isabella*.[3] But the order in which these elements of the story came to the poet's mind is immaterial, and does not affect the contention here first advanced, that for most of the numerous and essential details of the charming episode of

[1] It would be easy to show, for example, that there are many more parallels here than between *Filocolo* and the scene in *Troilus and Criseyde;* yet this scene is indubitably Chaucer's source.

[2] According to Palgrave, a chapbook "gives the legend in detail; furnishing obviously the outline of our poem" (p. 276). He finds this chapbook quoted in Brand's *Popular Antiquities*, under January 21, St. Agnes' day. (It is in the 1795 edition, and in Ellis' reprint in *Bohn's Antiquarian Library*, 1849.) Palgrave is wholly misleading here; the chapbook merely tells girls to fast, and not to allow kissing on that day, and to go to bed in a clean shift, and a clean night-cap, and lie straight, and keep both hands under the head, say a prayer to St. Agnes, and fall asleep as soon as possible, upon which the lover will come. There is nothing that "furnishes the outline of the Porphyro story." Keats may have learned of the custom from this source, however, though the recommendation about looking upward is not here.

[3] See st. xix of this poem, and Palgrave's note in his edition, p. 275.

Porphyro and Madeline, Keats is indebted to the *Filocolo* of Boccaccio.[1] He might have said of this as of the *Isabella:*

> But it is done—succeed the verse or fail—
> To honour thee, and thy gone spirit greet;
> To stead thee as a verse in English tongue,
> An echo of thee in the north-wind sung.

HENRY NOBLE MACCRACKEN

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

[1] I am inclined to think that Boccaccio may have been one of those who gave to Keats his love of mediaeval richness of description of colors, precious stones, and the details of beauty. On pp. 138–42 of the edition of the *Filocolo* already quoted is a description by Dario, friend of Filocolo, of the magic tower in which Biancofiore is confined. The passage, too long to quote entire, begins: "La torre dove le donzelle dimorano, come voi nel nostro porto entrando poteste vedere, è altissima tanto, che quasi pare che i nuvoli tocchi, e si è molto ampia per ogni parte: e credo che il sole che tutto vede mai si bella torre non vide, perocch 'ella e di fuori di bianchi marmi, e rossi, e neri, e d'altri diversi colori tutta infino alla sommità maestrevolemente murata e lavorata: a appresso ha dentro a se per molte finestre luce, le quali finestre divise da colonnelli non di marmo ma d' oro, tutti si possono vedere, le porti delle quali non sono legno ma lucente cristallo."

"TREES" ON THE STAGE OF SHAKESPEARE

The question whether any setting existed on the Elizabethan stage for the representation of woods and forests seems at first sight singularly lacking in importance and interest. It has not even the distinction of being much disputed, for practically all writers on the furnishings of the theater, who admit the use of any settings at all, agree that such a setting was actually employed. Nobody, however, seems to have realized the consequences of this admission. Discussions on the use of scenery, on methods of staging, on the very existence of certain properties, still continue, which, if the employment of this wood-setting were clearly established, would be either quite unnecessary or at least decidedly modified. Because of these far-reaching consequences then, if for no other reason, it may not be useless nor uninteresting to examine the evidence in favor of the existence of a forest-setting, to consider what that setting probably was, and to indicate the conclusions on more general subjects to which this examination points.

The purpose of this inquiry is to show: (1) that a forest-setting did actually exist; (2) that it was employed in a most unusual way and in situations where one would not naturally suppose it; (3) that in consequence of this use our whole attitude toward the subject of staging and our treatment of texts in this connection must radically change; and finally, (4) to illustrate more clearly than did my preceding papers[1] the fundamental principle of staging followed by Elizabethan dramatists and stage managers.

There are three classes of evidence for the existence of wood-settings on the stage of Shakespeare: the direct proof of the direc-

[1] "Some Principles of Elizabethan Staging," *Modern Philology*, April and June, 1905. The present paper is, like these, limited to a consideration of the plays produced before 1603. Later plays I shall consider at some future time—those given before 1614 at the Globe and Blackfriars, very soon, I hope. They seem, however, so far as I have yet examined them to confirm the conclusions already presented.

I am glad to take this opportunity to correct a misstatement (April, 1905, p. 31) that no one previous to Broadmeier had noted the existence of "split scenes." Mr. W. W. Greg has been kind enough to call my attention to his article "Webster's White Devil," in *Modern Language Quarterly*, December, 1900, in which this device is fully illustrated.

tions as printed in the old quartos, and of the expense accounts; the more doubtful evidence of the textual allusions, so common in a large number of the plays; and finally a curious bit which from its character must be left for the moment undescribed. The evidence under no one of these classes, except perhaps the last, is especially strong; but the total impression is, I think, certain and unmistakable.

The direct proof is practically nil. A reference here and there in the accounts of the Office of the Revels at court, e. g., "Tymber for the forest, ij sh. vj d." (p. 41; 1572–73); stray directions in unimportant plays, "Enter Neronis in the forest in man's apparel" (p. 169, *Sir Clyamon and Sir Clamydes*, 1599); "Here enter Sedmond with Clarissa and Conditions out of the wood" (l. 83, *Common Conditions*, before 1576), are all which offer themselves.

Textual allusions to woods are, on the other hand, extremely common; but skeptical readers have objected that this shows not a frequent use of the property, but no use at all; the poet having to indicate by his text the imagined scene of the action. Even if this objection be true, the number of the allusions shows at least how useful such a property would have been, and forces one to the conclusion that before many years so great a need must certainly have been supplied. But is the objection true? If the references to woods were dragged in, if they were of rare occurrence and then only in scenes where the plot absolutely required a forest-setting, one might doubt its reality. These allusions usually are introduced, however, without obvious effort, and sometimes into scenes where woods would actually be incongruous and improbable; where the author, indeed, would, according to all modern notions, avoid and not introduce allusions to forests and trees. Marston, for instance, in *Antonio and Mellida*, Act IV, in a scene situated probably on the sea-coast, and described as a "bleak waste," a "cold marsh," suddenly has his fugitive exclaim: "Even trees have tongues and will betray our life;" Marlowe, in *Dido*, Act I, makes Aeneas, just landed, tell his companions: "You shall have leaves and windfall boughs enow, near to these woods." Marsh and seashore are not commonly associated with woods; there is nothing in either situation to require the mention of trees

and woods. To say that such allusions take the place of wood-settings necessary to the plot is manifestly absurd; instead of being necessary, they are quite the reverse, and their presence must itself be accounted for.

A similar illustration occurs in Greene's *Alphonsus* (1599). The play is full of references to woods; if any play were ever so furnished, this one must have been. At about line 1060, Amurack, the Turkish king, awakens from a dream which has angered him against his wife Fausta. He rises in a rage from his chair—the scene is in his palace—and banishes her. With no clearing of the stage indicated—the emperor's chair is still upon the stage—Medea suddenly enters and inquires of Fausta what it is that causes her to leave the court "and all alone passe through these thickest groues." Why does Greene introduce this remark about groves? The scene at court certainly does not require, does not even allow, such an allusion. Is it not the most reasonable explanation to say that the remark is due, in part at least, to the actual presence of the setting on the stage? The play should have had this setting for other scenes; Greene, thinking of his scene as it would actually appear on the stage, knew that the woods would be there, perhaps near the door through which Fausta would go out; and naturally, perhaps half unconsciously, introduced the remark into his dialogue; the allusion thus arising, not from the absence of a necessary property, but from the presence of an unnecessary one.

Perhaps there was another reason, however; perhaps Greene did this consciously and with purpose. There was no real need of mentioning the woods in the palace scene, even though they were present on the stage, unless something we have not yet noticed influenced the dramatist. What this as yet unnoticed circumstance was, will, I think, be clear if we mentally review, first, the wood scenes of the Elizabethan drama, and, second, the scenes supposed to be located in solitary and desert places. In many cases these will coincide—the wood scenes are usually represented as solitary, the solitary scenes usually mention woods. One of the principal characteristics of the Forest of Arden, for instance, is its savagery and solitude. To emphasize this we are told of

the famished lion and the venomous snake, and of Orlando's and Adam's desperate need. Similarly, but in illustration of the second point, the scenes already referred to from *Dido* and from *Antonio and Mellida*, which are primarily conceived of as desolate and solitary, mention the woods and forests, even though the scene of the one is a seashore, and of the other a waste. Between woods, and solitude and desolation, there seems to have existed in the Elizabethan mind, and naturally enough, a close connection. The one suggested the other. When the dramatists came to stage their plays, they made use of this association. Suppose they wished to suggest a seashore, a heath, or a desert—any place solitary and savage and desolate. How could they do this? A bed would suggest very adequately a bedroom; a throne, a palace; but what could represent a waste? This association of forests with solitude gave them their clue, and in consequence we find woods referred to, not only in actual forest scenes, as might possibly have been the case had no wood-setting existed, but also in other scenes of solitude, where there is no reason for the reference except the actual presence of the setting upon the stage. The incongruity of using woods in a scene conceived of as a desert or a seashore was counterbalanced by making the necessary impression of desolation deeper and clearer in the minds of the audience. For this reason, then, Greene in *Alphonsus* refers to the trees already on the stage, since by so doing he emphasized the fundamental idea of the second part of his scene.

Perhaps this "extended" use of woods, if I may so term it, for any scene of desolation seems purely theoretical and impossible. It certainly is quite opposed to modern notions. Fortunately, however, direct proof of it exists in a single line of the Revels accounts (p. 41; 1572–73): "for provizion *and* cariage of trees *and* other things to the Coorte for a wildernesse in a playe, viij sh. vj d." No clearer statement could be desired: woods in 1572–73 were used at court to represent a wilderness. But such customs do not spring up nor die in a moment or a year. Neither are they usually limited to one place. Thus the fact that this particular reference is to a court play does not particularly weaken its force. Public companies played there: if this custom appealed

to them, there was nothing to prevent them from introducing it upon the public stage. This one line therefore not only shows that the extended use of the wood-setting for deserts and solitudes was an actual fact at court, but also makes it probable at other places and at other times. That the public theaters certainly did have the same custom is shown by the facts which are presently to be discussed under our third argument for the existence of the wood-setting. Before turning to that, however, we may note that the total result of the evidence from textual allusions is decidedly for the actual use of the setting, and that their extended use makes the whole subject of "trees" and of properties in general, even more important than one would at first have supposed.

The third argument for the existence of a wood-setting is based on three entries in the *Booke of Plaies* of Dr. Forman, the notorious astrologer and quack doctor of the early seventeenth century. This man, it will be remembered, attended plays largely, it would appear, for their "criticism of life," and when he returned home, made a short memorandum of what he had noticed in each play. Among the plays to which he listened were three of Shakespeare's—*Macbeth*, *Cymbeline*, and the *Winter's Tale*. His notes were founded on the actual productions at the theater: what he says of the methods of representation is therefore of unquestionable authority. Fortunately the notes on each of these plays record the use of forests or woods, and in such a way as to place beyond all doubt the existence of wood-settings, and, more than that, their use for scenes not necessarily wood scenes at all. In *Macbeth* (1610), he noted "how Macbeth and Banquo . . . . two noblemen of Scotland, riding through a wood, there stood before them three women Fairies." But the scene according to the text was not a wood at all, but a heath; there is not the slightest hint in the text—nor, for that matter, in Holinshed—of wood or forest. Where, then, did Forman get his ideas of the setting? If not from the words of the actors, it must have been from something on the stage, and from something which would have made a clear impression of woods upon him; in other words, from a wood-setting, and, be it noted, a wood-setting used, not for a true forest scene, but to suggest

solitude and desolation. Here, as in the Revels accounts, we have "trees for a wildernesse," and without a single hint of their presence in the text.

In *Cymbeline*, in like manner, Forman speaks of a "cave in the woods." To be sure, this scene might well be in a forest—there is nothing like the "heath" to contradict that idea—but the text does not suggest it, and therefore, as before, we ask how Forman came to say definitely that there was a wood. The most natural answer is again that what he saw was a wood scene, and that the actual stage properties suggested his remark.

The third play which Forman noted furnishes, like *Macbeth*, proof not only of wood-settings, but of their use in other scenes of solitude. He saw the *Winter's Tale* in 1611. In this he observed "how Perdita was caried into bohemia & ther laid in a forrest." The text does not mention tree or forest; the scene, as we all remember, is the famous "coast of Bohemia." Even the *History of Dorastus and Fawnia* does not suggest a wood. We have, then, three uses of wood-setting where the text does not suggest it, and two where the text would not, according to modern notions, even allow it. The existence of some sort of forest property and its use in the extended manner already described are thus established beyond a doubt.

Perhaps I may be allowed to emphasize also the importance of these three illustrations from Forman in another way. They show that the methods of study we have been applying to the old plays are quite inadequate. Most students have been very suspicious of textual allusions to properties, and have explained them away as poetic imaginings, or mere substitutes for purely imaginary furnishings. In consequence, even so well-versed a scholar as Mr. Sidney Lee speaks of the old stage as bare,[1] and other less well-informed writers base all their theories on the idea of an almost unset stage. Obviously this opinion is absolutely unfounded, for here are three instances where furnishings must have been employed, though neither text nor directions contain a hint of them. Possibly some directions and textual allusions are purely poetic and refer to imaginary settings; for example,

[1] *English Miscellany Presented to Doctor Furnivall*, p. 246.

"These stretching mountains clad with snow," *Wounds of Civil War* (1587?, published 1594), Act III; but the great majority of them are to be accepted as indicating real and practical furnishings. These notes of Forman's throw the burden of proof in any particular instance no longer upon those who believe that textual allusions refer to real properties, but upon the skeptics. Indeed, not only are textual allusions no longer to be doubted; scenes where there are none, but which from the nature of the story demand common settings, must be supposed in most cases to have been properly equipped even upon the public stage. One may doubt, perhaps, the existence of certain rare properties unless the directions specifically mention them, but where woods, thrones, tables, beds, chairs, arras, etc., etc., could be used to advantage, these notes of Forman's certainly warrant one in assuming their employment without mention either in direction or text. Thus one's whole attitude toward the old plays is changed: the furnishings were not simple nor the stage bare, for just as today properties not even required by the action were employed to make the scene more vivid and realistic.

But what was it like, this wood-setting? Was it a painted drop curtain; did it consist of trees, real or constructed; or was it a combination of both? That it was a real furnishing and not merely a label is certain. But what the forest-setting actually was, is hard, practically impossible, to determine. To me it seems to have been usually a collection of *trees*, perhaps supplemented by a painted curtain. There is absolutely no proof that I know of for this curtain, but it is so easy to provide that, if anyone wishes to suppose it existed, there is little reason for objecting; though how it would have done any particular good does not appear. For the individual trees there is, however, some evidence.

Single trees certainly were used on the old stage; they had even occurred in the early pageants. Nichols, in a description of the pageant at the coronation of Queen Elizabeth mentions one, for example, which was really elaborate. The Revels accounts also have many allusions to trees: "Tymber for the forest" (p. 41; 1572–73); "A tree of Holly for the Dutton's playe;" "other Holly for the forest" (p. 34; 1572–73). From the records for 1573–74

are the following: "Pap*er* for patternes *and* for leaves of trees" (p. 53); "Mrs. Dane for Canvas for . . . . great hollow trees" (p. 54); "armes of okes for the hollo tree" (p. 56); "Lathes for the Hollo tree" (p. 59); "fflagbroches for the knobb*es* of the tree" (p. 59). Plays on the public stage frequently require single trees. *The Spanish Tragedy* (Act III, scene 13) has one; in *The Case is Altered* (Act IV, scene 4) a man climbs up and hides in one; *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay* (scene 9) has, according to the text, a magic tree with leaves of gold; *The Battle of Alcazar*, published the same year, has a tree in its dumb show (Act V) from which, at the proper moment, crowns fall off; *The Fairy Pastoral* calls for a "Hollowe Oake with vice of wood to shutt to." In *The Warning for Faire Women* (dumb show, Act II) a tree suddenly rises which is later hewn down before the audience; *John A Kent and John A Cumber* (Act III, scene 1) calls for a character to enter out of a tree "if possible it may be." *Parasitaster* shows a tree by which a man climbs up into a balcony. *David and Bethsabe* (Act II, scene 10) probably had a tree, for it is referred to in the text, and the direction says: "Absalon hangs by the haire." To this there is a reference in Henslowe's diary: "Pd for poleyes and workmanshipp for to hange Absolome," etc. (p. 241). His list of properties also mentions trees: "a tre of gowlden apelles" and "Tantelouse tre." And so instances might be multiplied, showing that a single tree was no uncommon property, and that it sometimes was very elaborate in construction. To be sure, these elaborate trees would hardly be duplicated to represent a forest, and it is also possible, though not probable, that some of the single trees, like that in *Parasitaster*, were only the post which supported the balcony. Yet, giving all due regard to this possible explanation of a few instances, it is certain that trees were a common property on the old stage.

Not only did single trees exist, but many of the wood scenes require them, showing that the wood-setting, whatever it was, could not have been merely a curtain. A few illustrations must serve for many. *Gallathea* demands a special oak as well as woods; *Edward I* has a line, "I must hang my weapon upon this

tree" (l. 190), but also supposes woods in other scenes; *Common Conditions*, one of the few plays to speak of woods in the directions, has a girl bound to a tree (l. 165); *Orlando Furioso* is full of references to woods and must certainly have had such a setting; at line 575 Sacrapant says, "Hang up the Roundelays on the trees," and carves upon them the name of his love. A painted curtain would hardly have sufficed for these scenes. Heywood's spectacular *Brazen Age* (printed 1613) makes most elaborate requirements. Act V, scene 3, for instance, has these directions: "Enter Hercules from a rock aboue, tearing down trees;" "All the Princes breake downe the trees and make a fire in which Hercules placeth himselfe." Finally, the burlesque play of *Narcissus* (presented at St. John's College, Oxford, 1602) shows pretty clearly that wood scenes were represented by actual settings more or less like trees. A curtain could quite as easily and almost as humorously have been burlesqued as the setting which was actually held up to ridicule, but there is not a hint of a curtain for this purpose in the play. The scenery is prepared before the eyes of the audience in the following manner, and commented upon at the same time:

Enter one with a buckett and boughes and grasse.
A well there was withouten mudd,
Of silver hue, with waters cleare,
Whome neither sheepe that chawe the cudd,
Shepheards nor goates came ever neare;
Whome, truth to say, nor beast nor bird,
Nor windfalls yet from trees had stirrde.
(*He strawes the grasse about the buckett.*
And round about it there was grasse,
As learned lines of poets showe,
Which by next water nourisht was; (*Sprinkles water*)
Neere to it too a wood did growe. (*Sets down the bowes*)
To keep the place, as well I wott,
With too much sunne from being hott.
And thus least you should have mistooke it,
The truth of all I to you tell:
Suppose you the well had a buckett,
And so the buckett stands for the well;
And 'tis, least you should counte mee for a sot O,
A very pretty figure cald *pars pro toto.*

This is "symbolism" with a vengeance; but it certainly establishes, if the burlesque had any point at all, that the wood-setting actually did exist, and that it was sometimes, at least, in the form of separate trees.

Granting, then, that woods and forests were thus represented by individual trees, though not denying that a painted drop may also have been employed, we may well inquire how so strange and unwieldy a property was managed. It was, of course, not so difficult to arrange as a forest-setting similarly constituted would be upon our modern stage. A few trees—one, two, three, five—were enough, for the convention of "symbolic" scenery, by which one property suggested many, saved the Elizabethans much expense and trouble. It is therefore quite unnecessary to suppose that in a wood scene the "trees" covered any large part of the stage. *Orlando Furioso*, with half its action laid in the woods, must have had some open space for the other half. No one, indeed, could imagine the whole stage covered with trees. Two or three would have been quite sufficient.

What became of this "forest" during the other scenes of the play? Perhaps in some cases it was concealed by a curtain, but it is not at all necessary to suppose so. For here the other great principle of Elizabethan stage-craft came into play—that of simultaneous scenery with which English audiences had been long familiar—for example in the "standing" mediaeval Scripture plays, where Hell, Heaven, Galilee, and Jerusalem were all represented side by side at one time on the one stage.[1] The Elizabethan drama offers no such striking collocation as that, but, once more to refer to *Alphonsus*, a staging similar in principle occurs when the chair and woods are both before the audience at once; and several similar instances might be given. To us this, like the symbolic scenery, seems absurd; our ideas of dramatic reality are different from those of the Elizabethans, for we have been educated in a different school and expect different things from the theater.

Still we can appreciate how such a custom might arise even

[1] For a fuller discussion of this simultaneous staging and plays which illustrate it, see *Modern Philology*, June, 1905. Mr. John Corbin in *The Atlantic* for March, 1906, has a very interesting and suggestive article on the same subject.

today. We listen undisturbed to a public reader when he says before beginning a play: "The scene is a forest—on the right, a tree; on the left, a rock." We allow him, without leaving the stage, to change his scene to the city street or the interior of a house; we do not object if he returns in a moment or two to the tree and the rock again. Perhaps his hero is at some point in the play bound to the tree and left there during a scene or two. Of course, the tree is not represented—it could not be; but we imagine it and are quite content. Suppose, however, instead of the single reader, a whole company; allow them like him to change their scene at will—to move the place of action back and forth at the mention of a word. Such a situation is certainly conceivable and not especially confusing. Continue the picture. Suppose, as before, that the play requires one of the persons to be bound to a tree; obviously the tree must now actually be presented. To attempt to imagine the hero bound would be ridiculous. Yet there need not be a whole forest—it is not necessary to represent a complete background. We can still imaginatively furnish the rest of the stage as richly and completely as our experience and fancy permit. We should not object especially to the same sudden changes of scene as with the single reader; the tree might even be left on the stage without particularly disturbing us; but we would insist upon its being there when the plot required it. With a single reader its presence was impossible; with a whole company it becomes inevitable. This was exactly the situation upon the Elizabethan stage. Properties were used because they were necessary to the plot, and, with the realistic tendencies everywhere manifest in the old plays, we may well imagine them to have been as accurately and convincingly made as possible. Everything which the story required was provided freely, and perhaps some properties like the woods in scenes of desolation were employed merely to suggest the desired background. But as for accurately or completely representing the background, that was, on the projecting stage, neither possible nor, so far as we can see, desired.[1]

[1] I have so far practically disregarded the curtained rear stage. This, on account of its distance from the audience and its poorer lighting, would naturally be used less fre-

Thus the question of scenery settles itself if we think of it in any large way. We cannot say definitely, indeed, whether there were or not "drop curtains painted in perspective"—the question Malone wished to answer. That, however, is hardly the point, for much modern scenery would hardly come under such a description. We can say definitely that, so far as the front stage is concerned (and that, in the public theaters, must have been the most important), there was nothing like our modern system of settings which presents a complete and congruous picture; but that again is hardly the point either, for nobody with any knowledge of the old stage can suppose such a condition possible. Do we not mean, then, when we ask if scenery were used on the stage of Shakespeare: Were there any furnishings employed which were not really necessary, but which were used merely to make more vivid the supposed place of action, especially if that place were out-of-doors? To this the use of the wood-setting, especially for any scene of desolation, makes possible an affirmative answer; in proving it we have, I think, come nearest to showing that the English stage managers even in the sixteenth century had a desire similar to our own, not only for necessary, but also for appropriate settings —appropriate, however, from their point of view, though not necessarily from ours.

A second disputed question—Was the Elizabethan stage bare and unfurnished?—is of course answered by the proof of the existence of the forest-setting. If a property so difficult to construct and so cumbrous to manage were employed on the public stage, others quite as useful, but easier to procure, must certainly have been common—not only thrones, beds, chairs, and tables, of which we are already certain, but rocks, wells, shops,[1] and the

quently than the front stage. The plays, unless one assume many directions which are not given, indicate few scenes which are to be played in it. In this rear stage, backgrounds could conceivably have been arranged so as to present a complete illusion, especially of indoor scenes. Whether the wood-setting was ever so arranged seems quite impossible of proof from the plays dating in Elizabeth's reign. The general impression which the plays have left upon my own mind is, that usually the woods were not placed on the curtained space, but rather at the rear of the front stage, especially if the curtained space was an alcove, and if the front stage had direct access on either side to the tiring-house.

[1] It seems probable—practically certain, indeed, if one assumes the alcove stage—that the numerous "shops" and "studies" of the Elizabethan plays were usually particular arrangements of the rear stage. A later paper will discuss this fully.

numerous other settings necessary for the plays. Even the thrones, chairs, tables, and beds with the ever-present arras would have made the stage far from bare; with trees, rocks, etc., the stage becomes almost crowded. When it was thronged with gallants and set for an elaborate play, it must have presented a spectacle full of life and color, far removed from any suggestion of bareness or even simplicity.

Finally as to the method of staging. I have already pointed out in a preceding paragraph how it must have differed from that of our modern stage, and have emphasized how it was really symbolic—a reader's stage, with a whole company instead of a single performer. Students have erred in thinking that because the old theater did not attempt often to represent completely any particular scene, it had no properties nor furnishings at all. It is only by recognizing clearly the existence of a large number of varied properties, and the symbolic use of one for many to indicate rather than to represent a scene—in short, an elaborately furnished reader's stage—that we shall ever understand the staging of the Elizabethan drama, with its sudden changes of scene or its apparently entire disregard of scene, and with its conventions of dramatic distance and of "incongruous" properties—trees and beds upon the stage side by side at the same time.

Perhaps it will make the whole subject clearer to picture the performance of some play which used trees in all the various ways I have mentioned. As no such play occurs to me, an imagined plot must serve. The play is one of the romantic dramas so common to the Elizabethan stage. The scene shifts between a forest and a desert in Africa, and the city of Rome. Before the performance begins the stage is already set with most of the properties necessary for the production. Near one door stand three or four trees—as many as the theater owns and as the stage space allows. They are not especially large; their trunks are of painted canvas stretched upon lath; their branches are perhaps not so gracefully arched as in nature, and their leaves are of bright-green cloth. Near the other door are a chair and table. Between them are twenty or thirty three-legged stools, and in the background across the front of the rear stage hangs the closed curtain

with a scene from classic story painted upon it. Across the front of the balcony hangs a cloth painted to represent a wall, and over the two exposed doors are respectively the inscriptions "Rome" and "Africa." On the pillars hangs the title of the play—now, unfortunately, unknown. Soon the three-legged stools are almost filled by young gallants. Presently the trumpet sounds for the third time, and from between the curtains steps the prologue. Then the play begins. From the door marked "Rome" enter two people in conversation; the lady Sylvia is, it appears, to be married by her avaricious guardian to his foolish son. The trees do not disturb us by their presence—they are unmentioned, and are therefore unnoticed. As soon as these two are gone, the curtain parts, and the guardian is discovered in his own room bending over a chest and counting his ward's fortune. He sends for her; the beautiful boy who plays the part of Sylvia enters and is ordered to prepare for an immediate marriage. The heiress protests, but her guardian remains obdurate. Sylvia begins to prepare for flight as soon as he has left her, and we are soon aware from her remarks to her maid that the scene has changed to her chamber, even though she has not left the stage. Then the curtains, which have been open all this time, though most of the action has been in front of them, now close as she goes out through the door marked "Rome," but only to re-enter through "Africa."[1] From her words on "this forest dark," "these mighty trees," we notice that the scene has again shifted. But in following Sylvia we did not notice a boy steal through the door into one of the hollow trees. Now Sylvia appeals to the gods for help, and he steps forth, a wood nymph, and leads her off the stage to find seclusion in the depths of the forest. The scene returns to the city again, and we

[1] I violate here the "Law of Re-entry," if I may so term it, formulated by Robert Prölss, in *Von den ältesten Drucken der Dramen Shakespeares* (1905), p. 107, which I did not see until this article was in type. According to Prölss no character ever is allowed in the Elizabethan drama to leave the stage and immediately re-enter, if, in the meantime the location of the scene has changed. Conversation, soliloquy by some other character, or some other action is introduced to mark the break. The reason for such a custom on a stage like that of Elizabethan times is obvious, and in many cases I believe it was obeyed. It will, if I am not mistaken, go far to explain the insertion of many passages which are otherwise difficult to account for and which have been often supposed to be "out" scenes. But it was not always obeyed; e.g., in *English Traveller* (p. 69), and I therefore let my account of an imaginary production stand as first composed.

hear the guardian directing his son to pursue the escaped maiden. They sit at the table, and the father very carefully maps out his son's journey. The foolish boy and his father both leave the stage, but the boy immediately appears through the other door, and is, we learn, lost in the forest. He hears outlaws coming, and for concealment climbs into the shelter of a leafy tree. The outlaws discover him and, making him descend, tie him to the tree and leave him alone. Here his father fortunately finds him, and together they continue the pursuit. After a short scene in the city again, Sylvia appears, explaining how she has left the forest and taken refuge in this desert. Here, however, a disguised prince meets her and falls in love with her, introducing in his passionate appeal references to "these shaggy trees."

So the first act closes. The orchestra plays, and a clown enters and jigs. But during that amusement a great chair with a canopy above it comes creaking down from the "heavens." It is the throne of the prince's father, and the young gallants are made to rise and move their stools closer together. More stools are brought in and placed about the throne. The next scene is obviously to be one of importance and likely to tax the capacity of the stage. It will, indeed, for the court is to be represented, the whole strength of the company is required, and the stage with this crowd of actors and spectators combined is too small for the trees to be left upon it. So, since the forest scenes are over and their room is more valuable than their presence, they are taken through the door into the storeroom. With their disappearance our interest in the performance ends, and we leave it to work itself out in the only too well-known way to its happy conclusion.

In some such way as this wood-settings, and presumably all settings, were used on the old stage. That the Forest of Arden should ever again be so represented, except as a matter of antiquarian interest, is neither likely nor desirable. From our modern point of view the whole is chaotic, absurd, impossible, and the plays written for such production necessarily seem incoherent and inexplicable. But if we imagine them given on a "reader's stage," with its symbolic and simultaneous scenery, there is hardly one which does not at once become, so far as its staging

is concerned, simple and intelligible. The stage of Shakespeare was a "reader's stage," but it was by no means devoid of properties and furnishings; it was neither bare, primitive, nor childlike. It was merely different.

G. F. Reynolds

Shattuck School
Faribault, Minn.

THE GERMAN STORY IN ENGLAND ABOUT 1826

The revival of interest in German literature in the third decade of the nineteenth century was more widespread in England than is commonly supposed. Contrary to the opinion generally held, Thomas Carlyle was not the only one nor the first[1] to reawaken this dormant interest, though he was, to be sure, the most eminent interpreter that German literature had found in England up to his time. He zealously devoted most of his energy during the third decade to the translating and reviewing of such German works as he thought his countrymen ought to know. The first one to appear in book form was his model translation of *Wilhelm Meisters Lehrjahre* (1824). Then followed his *Life of Schiller* (1825), a biography based on articles in the *London Magazine*, 1823–24, but carefully revised and enlarged.[2] And two years later *German Romance* (1827) appeared. This collection of stories in four volumes—the original edition of which is now much prized by collectors, as the translations from Fouqué and Hoffmann have not been reprinted[3]—was begun in May, 1825, and was finished, and paid for Carlyle's marriage expenses, in July, 1826.[4] But not until the following year did the publisher (Tait) give Carlyle "an opportunity of sending off the weary book," as the author writes to his wife, January 2, 1827.

It is very probable that Tait, fearing a financial failure, had delayed publication for a time, as the demand for German stories had been evidently supplied by no less than five collections that had appeared in 1826. This fact, though interesting and important in showing that others besides Carlyle were interested in German literature, is not mentioned, so far as I know, in any contributions bearing on Carlyle or on German literature in England. On this account it may be worth while to pass in review these collections,

[1] Cf. my articles in *Modern Language Notes*, Vol. XVII, No. 3 and Vol. XVIII, No. 3.

[2] See my article in *Modern Philology*, Vol. I, No. 3.

[3] R. H. Shepperd, *Memoirs of the Life and Writings of Thomas Carlyle* (London, 1881).

[4] Froude, *Thomas Carlyle*, Vol. I, p. 241 *et passim*.

their authors, and the opinions of German literature as expressed in their prefaces.

1. *German Popular Stories.* Translated from the Collection of J. L. and W. K. Grimm by Edgar Taylor. London, 1826. Published anonymously.
2. *Tales of Humour and Romance.* Selected from Popular German Writers and Translated by Richard Holcraft, B. A. London, 1826.
3. *Specimens of German Romance.* Selected and Translated from Various Authors by George Soane. In three volumes. London, 1826. Published anonymously.
4. *The German Novelists.* Tales from the Earliest Period down to the Close of the Eighteenth Century. By Thomas Roscoe. In four volumes. London, 1826.
5. *German Stories.* Selected from the Works of Hoffmann, de LaMotte Fouqué, Pichler, Kruse, and others. By R. P. Gillies, Esq. In three volumes. Edinburgh, 1826.

The first of these collections is of slight import in the discussion at hand, as it contains fairy-tales rather than stories or romances; but the author deserves a short notice. Edgar Taylor (1793–1839), a barrister in partnership with one of the brothers of Thomas Roscoe, of whom I shall have more to say, was known as a translator in his day. In the previous year (1825) he published, in collaboration with his cousin, the distinguished interpreter of German life and literature, Sarah Austin, a volume entitled *Lays of the Minnesingers*, in which the attention of English readers is called to the well-nigh unknown stores of mediaeval poetry. These two collections are, however, so far as I know, the only ones that Taylor translated from the German.

Despite a very diligent search, I was unable to find any data about the author of the second collection, Richard Holcraft. Only this is certain: He knew something of the range of German literature, for he included in his volume, besides stories of Langbein and La Fontaine, selections from E. T. A. Hoffmann, Schiller, Körner, and even Jean Paul Richter, of whom Carlyle said in 1827 in the *Edinburgh Review*, No. 91: "Except by name Richter is little known out of Germany." But Holcraft was familiar with this author, for he says of his writings (Preface, p. viii):

> They are by far too sentimental, too imaginative, and too metaphorical, and his characters too simple, and unsophisticated for the present

state of English readers. . . . . Those who are gifted with a little more imagination than their neighbors will find in the succession of touching episodes of this writer, more than enough to counterbalance the imperfections that fastidious critics might find in the style.

Holcraft's translations are on the whole, more faithful than English translations were wont to be at the beginning of the nineteenth century. Little is omitted, and but few variations from the original occur. At times, however, the translator guesses at the meaning of a word and then, of course, blunders woefully, as when he renders, in Schiller's *The Dishonoured Irreclaimable*, *sinnlich* by "thoughtful," *entwischte* by "dispersed;" or in Körner's *Woldemar*, *überraschte* by "joined;" or, even more seriously, when he translates, in Körner's *The Harp*, *mit unendlicher Heiterkeit* by "in deep distress." Nevertheless, it must be admitted that Holcraft was familiar with German, and that he deserves credit for presenting to the English public selections from Körner and Richter.

George Soane (1790–1860), the younger son of Sir John Soane, the famous architect, began his literary career several years prior to Carlyle. He wrote a considerable number of novels and plays that won more or less favor with the English public, and manifested his interest in German literature as early as 1818 by translating Fouqué's *Undine*. Three years later he supplied extracts from Goethe's *Faust* to illustrate Moritz Retsch's drawings. This translation called down the censure of Carlyle and induced him to send to the *New Edinburgh Review* (April, 1822) his spirited essay on Goethe's *Faust*.[1] But Soane, nothing daunted, sent forth in rapid succession Fouqué's *Minstrel Love* (1821), Caroline de LaMotte Fouqué's *The Outcasts* (1824), and in 1826 *Specimens of German Romance*, with illustrations by the famous artist, George Cruikshank. He included in his collection stories from contemporary writers who had gained considerable popularity, but most of whom have since fallen into oblivion. Volume I contained C. F. van der Velde's *The Patricians;* Vol. II, E. T. A. Hoffmann's *Master Flea;* Vol. III, F. Laun's *The Blind Passenger*, A. Oehlenschläger's *The Adventurers*, and B. Naubert's *The*

[1] Cf. Wilhelm Streuli, *Thomas Carlyle als Vermittler deutscher Litteratur und deutschen Geistes* (Zürich, 1895), pp. 33 ff.

Mantle. The comments that the London *Literary Gazette* (June 10, 1826) makes on these stories are worth quoting:

> Ushered in by frontispieces as wildly extravagant and grotesque as ever entered into even a German brain, these tales are what they profess to be. . . . . The tale with the odd title "Master Flea" is the strangest of a strange kind; some of it we must allow to be amusing, but it is too disjointed. Now "The Mantle" is excellent in its kind, but "The Adventurers" is our favourite.

Six months later (January 20) the same magazine says:

> Mr. Soane's volumes bade fair to rebut much of the too general accusation against German tales being but those of horror.

It must be added before we turn to the next collection, that Soane, though unable to render adequately *Faust* into English verse, could and did translate German prose into acceptable English.

Thomas Roscoe (1791–1871) was the son of the historian William Roscoe, who is made the subject of one of the most charming essays in Irving's *Sketch Book.* Irving speaks of the magnificent library of Italian books that was gathered in the Roscoe household; and to this Thomas, of course, had access. Hence his interest in Italian and other foreign literatures and his consequent translations of Benvenuto Cellini's *Memoirs* (1822), *The Italian Novelists* (1825), and *The Spanish Novelists* (1832), and, what is of interest at the present moment, his collection of tales from *The German Novelists* (1826). Volume I and the larger part of Vol. II of this work contain popular traditions as recorded in the *Heldenbuch* or by such writers as Otmar, Gottschalk, Grimm, Büsching, etc. The other volumes are devoted to selections from Fouqué, Musaeus, Schiller, Tieck,[1] Langbein, and Engel. Several of these stories are found also in Carlyle's *German Romance* (e. g., Musaeus' *The Dumb Lover* and Tieck's *The Faithful Eckart* and *Auburn Egbert*) and in Holcraft's *Tales* (e. g., Schiller's *Martyr to Lost Honour*), despite the fact that the translators tried to avoid duplication.[2]

[1] The *Monthly Review* (CXI, p. 145) voicing the sentiments of the average Englishman, said in a lengthy criticism of these volumes: "Tieck, considered as a novelist, is a complete exemplar of all the most extravagant horror-mongers who infest the literature of Germany. Langbein has produced with less power perhaps than Tieck several compositions of far more rational and probable interest."

[2] See Carlyle's and Gillies' prefaces to their respective collections.

Roscoe's volumes are of especial interest to us because of their biographical introductions in which estimates of the various authors represented are expressed. Of Langbein for example, Roscoe says (Vol. IV, pp. 133 f.):

> As a novel-writer he will be found to rank among the foremost who have infused a more light and animated spirit into their productions, since the revival of the modern literature of Germany. He discovers less of a national and peculiar tone than most writers of fiction, who have either preceded or followed him; his delineations of manners and characters are more general and universal; the interest attaching to them is more in unison with modern tastes and feelings; while the keen and lively, yet good-natured, air of satire, thrown over his reflections, presents us with much of the pleasure of ironical observation without the sting.

Such extravagant praise of an author well-nigh forgotten now-a-days seems uncalled for. Fouqué's stories, on the other hand, are more justly estimated (Vol. II, p. 308):

> There is a consistency of plan, united to a sincerity of tone, and earnestness of feeling, which cannot easily be mistaken for the qualities of any contemporary writer, in the same class of fiction; and which have the effect of riveting down the attention, even to the most wild and improbable portion of his stories.

But Roscoe's comments on Schiller are especially significant, showing, as they do, the change of attitude toward Schiller, due, to a large extent, to the influence of Coleridge and Carlyle. Roscoe says (Vol. III, p. 109):

> The Robbers of Schiller's youth is the Wallenstein of his maturer powers; it bore the height and dimensions of his full genius, though destitute of its manlier tone, action, and consummate strength. . . . . With the single exception of Wallenstein, the most finished specimen of his dramatic labours, The Robbers is justly, we think, one of the most popular of his dramas.

As a translator Roscoe ranks fairly high, though he does not at all times render the German text accurately. In Musaeus' *The Dumb Lover*, for example, he translates *er liess an den achselzuckenden Haushalter den Befehl ergehen* by "shrugging up his shoulders, he ordered his cashier," etc. Carlyle, in his version of the same story, proves himself a superior and more careful worker. Nevertheless, Roscoe's volumes have survived and are still valuable to those, unfamiliar with German, who are desirous of getting a

fairly adequate idea of the range of the German story about the beginning of the nineteenth century.

Of Robert Pearse Gillies (1788–1858) as an interpreter of German literature I have spoken more at length in *Modern Language Notes* (*loc. cit.*). There I endeavored to show that he contributed to the *Foreign Quarterly Review* and *Blackwood's Magazine* articles dealing almost exclusively with the German drama, and that he rendered thereby a very useful service to German literature, though his literary judgments were not always trustworthy. Here we are concerned with his knowledge and his opinions of German story-writers.

These translations, says Gillies in his Introduction to *German Stories*, are now printed in consequence of that increasing interest which seems lately to have been excited in favor of German stories. Critics, he continues, who before talked glibly of *the* German school (as if there were but *one*), begin to perceive that in this neglected language, which hitherto rarely formed a branch of what is called a liberal education, every possible variety of composition and style may be discovered. Such prejudices being cleared away, versions, therefore of minor German novels, without alteration, may prove acceptable now, as those from Italian sources were popular and current two centuries ago.

He closes his Introduction with these general and, to a large extent, pertinent characterizations of the German novelists of his day:

> German readers are, in fact, very easily excited, and in their popular romances, while incident and character are by no means wanting, yet these are seldom or never brought forward in that style of *alto relievo* which has become indispensable in this country. On the contrary, the novelist may come before the public as often as he thinks proper, in nightgown and slippers, quite assured that he will be greeted with as much good will (if not as much respect) as if he were in gala attire, with brilliant stars and ribbons. The minor arts of composition are often disregarded. Metaphors are confused and broken; long passages of tame dialogue are allowable, and the same word may be used, not always in the same sense, ten times within one page. Notwithstanding all this, the book may have its share of ingenuity and interest.

Volume I of Gillies' collection contains the following selections: *Mademoiselle de Scuderi* (Hoffmann), *Scharfenstein Castle*

(Baroness de LaMotte Fouqué), *The Sisters;* Vol. II, *Rolandsitten or The Deed of Entail* (Hoffmann), *Georg Selding* (Pichler), *The Siege of Antwerp;* Vol. III, *The First of May or Walburga's Night, Oath and Conscience* (Kruse), *The Spectre Bride, The Crystal Dagger* (Kruse), *The Warning.*

The *Literary Gazette* (London, November 11, 1826) in reviewing these stories, said among other things:

> The tales to which we now call our readers' attention are calculated for great popularity. . . . . The Germans are the best narrators of a tale of dark and mysterious murder, or one of spiritual or shadowy intercourse.

Then this clever piece of advice is added:

> In giving a specimen of The Spectre Bride, we beg it may be perused some dark rainy night; all the rest of the house in bed and asleep; with the candles properly unsnuffed; and if in an old country house, so much the better.

The review closed with these words of high praise, especially significant in view of the fact that all the above-mentioned collections had been carefully analyzed previously in the columns of the same magazine:

> Since 1791 when Mr. Beckford published anonymously his Tales from the German, we have not seen any publication of the kind equal to this of Mr. Gillies.

And two months later (January 20, 1827) the *Literary Gazette* in its review of Carlyle's *German Romance* makes this interesting comment concerning the two translators and their work:

> Mr. Gillies was the very model of a translator. Still much remained to be done; and the author of the present volumes has found very sufficient space for the exertion of the talent and industry which his pages display. He has ventured into perhaps less certainly popular paths of our neighbours' literature: and we much doubt (indeed we could not wish) our English taste becoming reconciled to the sentimentality (with all its poetry) of Richter, or the mysterious mysticism of Wilhelm Meister. Still these are works we like to see translated.

This brings us to the most important of the six collections, that of Carlyle. His *German Romance* is in almost every respect superior to all its predecessors: in choice of stories, in accuracy and vigor of translation, in literary acumen, as displayed in the

prefatory remarks.[1] In fact, it is here as elsewhere that Carlyle's genius shines all the more because of contrast. Although he himself ranked this work very low in later years,[2] it proved nevertheless to be of sufficient importance to warrant reprinting more than once. Since on that account it is easily accessible, I shall refrain from quoting here the author's opinion of German literature as recorded in his several biographical introductions.

To sum up: German literature in England, after the first burst of enthusiasm at the end of the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth centuries, was neglected or depreciated for a number of years; but in the third decade of the last century again attracted attention because of the appearance of numerous reviews and adequate English versions of dramas, poems, and works of fiction. Carlyle, however, though eminently successful in making some of these translations, as witness, e. g., his *German Romance* (1827), was, contrary to general supposition, by no means the only one engaged in this task, as the various collections of German stories that appeared in 1826 amply demonstrate.

MAX BATT

NORTH DAKOTA AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE

[1] Cf. *Monthly Review*, June, 1827: "The mass of biography and criticism forms infinitely the most attractive portion of the work." Tieck and Hoffmann are again grossly undervalued.

[2] W. Streuli, *loc. cit.*, p. 47.

SOME ITALIAN REMINISCENCES IN CERVANTES

Cervantes' indebtedness to Italian literature of the *Cinquecento* was very considerable. Was he, likewise, familiar with the works of earlier writers? It would be rash, indeed, to answer the question categorically. Sr. Menéndez y Pelayo, in his brilliant article on Cervantes' reading,[1] does not even suggest the problem. Limiting the inquiry, for the nonce, to Dante, it must be noted at the outset, that by the close of the sixteenth century Dantesque simile, and the general scheme and scope of the *Divine Comedy*, had become such commonplaces that it is very difficult at times to fix the immediate source of an allusion, or expression, that seems to hark back to Dante. In the *Canto de Calíope*, Cervantes makes the epic muse say: "I am she who made the famous Dante descend to the dark circles of Hell, and ascend to the bright spheres of Heaven." Such vague words need not necessarily attest acquaintance, or familiarity, with Dante's masterpiece. But in the *Galatea* proper occurs a prose rendering of Francesca da Rimini's lament:

> Nessun maggior dolore,
> Che ricordarsi del tempo felice
> Nella miseria; . . . .

which Cervantes renders: "puesto que fuera mejor no acordarme de cosas alegres en tiempo tan triste" (ed. 1863, I, p. 21). To confirm the suspicion that Cervantes had Canto V of the *Inferno* in mind when writing the above version, attention may be called to an apparent adaptation of Dante's desire to learn of the *prima radice* of the love of Paolo and Francesca. It will be recalled that in the *Galatea* Lisandro is telling Elicio of his first letter to Leonida, when he used the words quoted above. "No," interrupted Elicio, "no es justo que me dejes de decir la carta que á Leonida enviaste, que por ser la primera, y por hallarte tan enamorada en aquella sazón, sin duda debe de ser discreta."[2]

[1] *Revista de Archivos*, May, 1905.

[2] Lope de Vega quoted from Canto V in *Las Flores de Don Juan*, ed. Rivad., I, p. 423*c*:

> como el Dante dice,
> Amor á ninguno amado,
> Que no amase perdonó; . . . .

and in *Angélica en el Catay*, ed. Acad., p. 422.

Cervantes repeats Francesca's words in the same work (II, p. 43): "mas; ay del alma desdichada, que se ve puesta en términos de acordarse del bien perdido." In his play, *El Gallardo Español* (X, p. 75), we find the reverse of the *nessun maggior dolore:*

Pasadas penas en presente gloria,
El contarlas la lengua no repuna. . . . .

This was not necessarily original with Cervantes. Poets had long since rung the changes on Francesca's plaint. One need only recall Guicciardini's stanza:

Son due veri conforti all' infelice,
L' un rimembrarsi il tempo in cui già visse
Con maggior doglia, l' altro in mente havere
S' alcun vive di lui più tristo al mondo.[1]

Whether or not Cervantes' immediate source was Dante (or, indeed, Boethius), or some Peninsular version, the above renderings are to be added to those collected by Kraus, *Beil. d. allg. Zeit.*, 1900, No. 136, Sanvisenti, *I primi influssi di Dante . . . . sulla letteratura spagnuola, ...* 1902, p. 167, and Farinelli, *Appunti su Dante in Ispagna . . . .* 1905, p. 53, footnote, as, also, the following: "El triste recordar del bien pasado," Gutierre de Cetina, *Obras*, 1895, I, p. 82; "En todo tiempo, la memoria de un bien estado causa soledad al que le ha perdido," Montemayor, *La Diana*, I, Lib. VI:

Que no hay mayor desdicha en las desdichas
Que haber sido dichoso un desdichado.
—Vélez de Guevara, ed. Rivad., p. 166*c*.

Quéjome tambien aquí
De la pertinaz memoria,
Porque me acuerda la historia
De tantos bienes pasados.
—Lope de Vega, ed. Rivad., IV, p. 64*b*.

In *El Celoso Extremeño* (VII, p. 336) occurs a Dantesque passage: "Quien ha visto banda de palomas estar comiendo en el

[1]The second sentiment was dear to Spanish poets; see, for example: Tirso, V, 174; Lope, ed. Acad., V, 668; Calderón, *La vida es sueño*, ll. 250 ff., etc. Still another variant may be cited here:

El dia dell' alegria
al qu' es triste
de mayor dolor le viste.
—*Cancionero General de Hernando de Castillo*, ed. 1882, I, 542.

campo sin miedo lo que ajenas manos sembraron, que al furioso estrépito de disparada escopeta se azora y levanta, y olvidada del pasto, confusa y atónita cruza por los aires; tal . . . . ," Dante's corresponding simile is as follows:

Come quando, cogliendo biado o loglio,
Li colombi adunati alla pastura,
Queti senza mostrar l' usato orgoglio,
Se cosa appare ond' elli abbian paura,
Subitamente lasciano star l' esca,
Perchè assaliti son da maggior cura;
Così. . . . .
—*Purgatorio*, Canto II, ll. 124–30.

Ariosto used a much briefer simile:

Come conigli o timidi colombi,
A cui vicino alto rumor rimbombi.
—*Orlando Furioso*, Canto XX, 92.

Guido Guinicelli's simile of the sun is familiar to everybody:

Fiere lo sole lo fangho tutto il giorno, vile roman nè l sol perde calore. . . . .

Cervantes offers the following version: "la poesia . . . . es como el sol, que pasa por todas las cosas inmundas sin quę se le pegue nada, ... " IX, p. 275. From the use of the expressions *inmundas* and *se le pegue*, one might infer that his source was the result of a blending of the version in the *Fiore di Virtù*—or a parallel—quoted by Gaspary in his *History of Early Italian Literature*, 1901, p. 101, footnote: "Il sole sta in su lo fango, e non se gliene appicca," and Augustine's: "Spiritualis enim virtus sacramenti ita est ut lux: et ab illuminandis pura excipitur, et si per inmundos transeat, non inquinatur."[1]

MILTON A. BUCHANAN
UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

[1] For the version quoted from Augustine, as, also, for other parallels, see Professor Cook's study in *Modern Language Notes*, 1905, pp. 68–69. An additional English rendering (from Middleton) was published by Professor Tennant in the same volume of the journal (p. 160). Torraca, in his *Manuale della letteratura italiana*, 1898, I, p. 53, n. 5, gives an Italian version not noted by Professor Cook. See, also, King, *Classical Quotations*, 1904, pp, 216–217.

GALAHAD AND PERCEVAL

FROM THE "TRISTAN" MS ADD. 5474, FF. 142 c – 164 b BRITISH MUSEUM *

(Sir Thomas Malory's *Le Morte Darthur*, Books XI and XII)

II

Or dist li contes & la uraie estoire le tesmoigne que agloual erra .ii. ans entiers que onques ne trouua qui noueles li deist de lancelot a la parfin ot tant ale que auenture lamena chies sa mere qui moult estoit de grant lignage. mais pour courous de son seignour & de ses fiex qui mout orent grant uaselage qui ochis auoient este si estoit tant desconfortee que ele se sentoit trop pourement. & quant ele uoit agloual si en ot moult grant ioie. car bien auoit passe .v. ans que ele ne lauoit mais ueu. & quant ele le uit si ploura mout de la grant ioie quele en ot. quant agloual fu descendus il vit vn vallet deuant lui moult biel & moult iouene & moult bien tailliet de tous menbres & si nauoit mie plus de .xv. ans passes [*fol. 152, col. a*] biaus fiex cou dist la mere counissies uous cest enfant. dame fait il nenil. enondieu fait ele cou est parcheuaus uos freres li plus iouenes de tous mes enfans. quant agloual entendi cele parole si en est tant lies quil ne set[1] quil puist faire. de son frere que il a ensi trouue. car il samble bien hom qui grant bien & grant honor doiue auoir se dame diex li done bonte si comme il li auoit done biaute. si li fait si grant ioie que plus ne pot & dist a sa dame de mere. cest enfant menrai iou a la court le roi artu si receuera lordene de cheualerie de sa main meesme.

Haꝰ biaus fiex fait la mere il ne place a dieu que il soit cheualiers. car de cheualerie ne porroit il mie a plus grant honor uenir que mi autre fil sont fait qui en sont mort adoulour pai armes. & puis que li autre sont mort iou garderai le remanant car ia se dieu plaist nel garderai. haꝰ biaus fiex ne saues uous le biele maisnie que iou auoie de .vi. fiex dont diex ma deliuree fors de vous seulement dont ie ne quidoie point huimatin auoir. dame fait il ken baes uous afaire. ie uoeil fait ele que il soit od moi tant con ie uiurai comme celui que iou aim de tout mon cuer. car toutes mes pertes & de toutes mes mescheanches uai iou

*[As the Introduction to this text presupposes the existence of an article by Dr. Sommer, "The Queste of the Holy Grail," which appears in the current volume of *Romania*, it has been deemed better to let the Introduction follow, rather than precede the text. This, together with the final instalment of the text, will be published in the January number of *Modern Philology*.— Eds.]

[1] "Quil ne set," repeated in MS.

plus de cou fort & il se taist atant & parole dautre chose & quant il fu eure de mangier. si mangierent moult bien & furent assis moult ricement. mais nule rien que agloual uoie ne li plaist autant comme la biaute de son frere. si dist a soi meesme que mout seroit damages grans se si biaus enfes vsoit sa vie entour sa mere. car si com il dist il ne puet estre sil est cheualiers de tel aage quil ne viegne a grant honor se diex iueut conseil metre & a che quil est de toutes pars estrais de boines gens. & sil passe lage de iouenece & il vient en la age de .xxx. ans & il nest dedens cel termene acoustumes de cheualerie ia puis niert boins cheualiers ne preus as armes pour coi iou di que che sera trop grans damages sil nest cheualiers.

A ceste chose pensa agloual tant comme il se sisent au mangier. & quant la table fu ostee si sala agloual deduire en .i. iarding qui estoit deiriere le maison sa mere. & sa dame li enuoia percheual pour lui faire compaignie. & li enfes qui il estoit moult biel & qui plus amoit la compaignie de lui que de sa mere troua agloual gisant de sous .i. pumier si le salua moult biel si sasist iouste lui & il le recut mout deboinairement. lors li commence a demander [*fol. 152, col. b*] se il uauroit aler ala court le roi artu. pour estre cheualiers.

Certes fait percheuaus iou ne desirai onques tant rien com iou fai a estre cheualiers sil plaisoit a nostre seignor. & se iou quidoie que vous me vausissies mener o vous iou iroie moult uolentiers. pour estre cheualiers quant vous vous enires. voire fait agloual si desires tant a estre cheualiers. certes il mest moult bel & iou vous imenrai moult uolentiers si tost com iou me departirai de chaiens & che sera prochainement. car en nule maniere iou ne demourroie longement en cest pais. mais iou uoeil que vous de ceste cose ne parles ia. car se ma dame le sauoit ele vous feroit si pres gaitier que iamais ne uous en porries partir & li enfes dist quil nen parleroit ia a home ne a feme. iiii. iours demora laiens agloual si fu moult bien seruis & chier tenus de sa dame & de ses amis. El quint iour dist agloual a percheual son frere. biaus amis que ferons nous il men couuient aler le matin dites enuenres vous od moi ou vous remanres. sire fait perceuaus iou vous ai creante que iou men iroie o vous si le vous tenrai si bien que iou menirai od vous toutes les eures que vous en vaures aler. il conuerra fait agloual quen tel maniere le fachons que ma dame ne sen apercoiue ne autres qui chaiens soit. car sele en sauoit rien iou sai bien que de si pres vous gaiteroit que apaines enporries escaper or ne uous caut fait perceuax car iou en pensera moult bien & si vous dirai comment. quant vous seres armes & apareillies iou demanderai a madame congie de vous conuoier & ele le me donra mout uolentiers & lors men irai od uous en tel maniere que ia puis ne retournerai deuant cou que iou serai cheualiers. & agloual dist que ensi le porroit il bien faire & sans nule male esparanche de nului

Cele nuit demoura laiens agloual & dist a sa mere. dame iai chaiens demoure grant pieche pour lamour de vous & si eusse plus grant mestier derrer. que de seiourner. si vous pri que vous me dones congiet par coi iou men puisse demain aler & metre a la uoie. car moult me tarde que iou viengne a la court le roi artu. car iou ni fui passe a .ii. ans ou plus. quant la mere entendi cele parole si li demanda pour coi il sen uoloit aler & il dist que faire le me couuient pour coi iou uous pri que [*fol. 152, col. c, verso*] uous me dounes congiet. car demain memetrai iou a la uoie. car mout me tarde que iou soie a la court le roi artu. quant la mere oi chou si li doune congiet mout uolentiers mais ancois en ploura mout durement. alendemain si tost con li iours aparut biaus & clers se leua perceuaus qui mout estoit en grant esfroi de ceste cose si apareilla enteil maniere son afaire son cheual & ses armes quil ot tout prest

Quant agloual fu leues il alerent oir mese si se desieunerent & lors demanda agloual ses armes & on li aporta & quant il fu apareillies. il commanda sa mere adieu & sen parti atant & quant il fu hors perceuaus sen vint a sa mere se li dist. dame dones moi congiet de conuoier mon frere iusqua lentree du boskiel qui la ius est car iou iroie mout uolentiers & ne sai se iou le uerrai iamais. biaus fiex cou dist la mere iou uous commant a dieu. mais gardes que uous ne demoures & menes od vous .i. escuier qui vous fera compaignie & penses de tost reuenir pour mon cuer esleechier. car iamais ne serai lie deuant que iou uous reuoie. & perceuaus qui nauoit nule uolente de reuenir sieut agloual son frere & sen uait od lui a la court le roi artu pour estre cheualiers comme chil qui tant ne desiroit nule rien ne ne uieult que nus aille od lui. mais la mere fist erranment monter .i. escuier & li commanda quant il fu montes quil li ramenast son enfant arrierc. & il dist que si feroit il mout uolentiers.

Perceuax se part de sa mere & .i. escuiers od li si cheuauchent tant en tel maniere quil ataignent agloual alentree du boskiel. & agloual estoit ales tout bielement pour atendre son frere car bien sauoit quil le sieuroit si tost comme il porroit auoir congiet de sa mere. & quant il le suit uenir il en fu mout lies. si errerent el bos & parlerent de mainte coses tant que il fu haute heure du iour & lors anuia mout alescuier. si dist a percheual. sire ralons nous ent arriere ne saues vous que uostre mere vous dist. si mait diex iou crien mout que ele ne soit a malaise. car nous ne reuenrons mais hui a court che sai iou bien. & perceuaus li dist biaus amis seufre toi vn poi & alons encore auant & chil se taist atant. & li doi frere ceuauchent iusqua heure de none & tant que ele fu passee [*fol. 152, col. d, verso*] & que il fu pres de uespres. & lors redist li escuiers a percheual. haꝰ sire vous estes oublies si con iou quit. vous aues tant ale que nous ne venrons mie alostel de iours. lors dist perceuaus au uallet comment se diex tait quides tu que iou me soie departis de lostel ma mere pour si tost reuenir arriere. saches tu que iou ne retournerai

iamais deuant che que iou serai cheualiers nouuiaus & que iou arai este a la court le roi artu qui cheualier me fera. ains que iou reuoie ma mere si uoel que tu ten ailles arriere & di a ma mere que ele nait mie paour de moi. car iou men uois a la court le roi artu auoec mon frere. & bien li di pour coi iou i vois. & li di que iou le uenrai ueoir si tost con iou porrai comme celi qui iou mout aim & bien le doi faire.

Quant li escuiers entent ceste parole il est tant courechies que nus plus. lors commencha a plorer mout angoiseusement & dist ha~ sire pour dieu que est che que vous dites ensi nel feres uous mie. si ferai fait percheuaus che sachies. sire fait chil. puis quil est ensi laissies ment aler od vous si uous seruirai cheualier ausi con iou ai fait damoisel & iou lotroi fait percheuals. mais que tu ailles dire a ma dame que iou menuois auoec mon frere & quant tu auras fait cest mesage si ten uerras a la court le roi artu. se ancois ne ma consieus. & chil len merchie mout de cest don[1] si se part atant de son seignour & erra tant quil vint au soir a sa dame & quant il fu descendus & il li ot dites les noueles teles comme il les sauoit. la mere qui tant amoit percheual que nule plus commencha a plourer moult durement.

Lors manda la dame tout maintenant son capelain si se fist confesse & rechut corpus domini si trespassa cel soir meesme & lendemain fu mise en tere. quant che fu fait si se parti li escuiers de laiens. & ceuaucha tant que il vint a vn rechet ou on haoit agloual sor tous les homes del monde dont il avint que si tost quil seclama dagloual que maintenant si sires le fist ochirre & ieter en vne fose & agloual auoit .ii. iours seiourne en vne abeie pour che que vn poi auoit este deshaities. si sen parti au plus tost quil onques pot. si li auint quil passoit deuant la maison au cheualier le iour que on auoit le uallet ochis. & si tost con percheuaus le uit il le recounut moult bien. ensi con percheuaus esgardoit le uallet issi de laiens .i. ualles & vne damoisele & il lor demanda qui le uallet auoit ochis. & il li [*fol. 153, col. a*] dist tout maintenant que li sires du castiel lauoit ochis pour lamour dagloual dont il se clama. & agloual quant il entent ceste parole il relacha son hiaume & dist a percheual qui plouroit pour lamour du uallet qui mors estoit si li dist quil latente & il dist que si fera il.

Lors entra agloual laiens & troua le seignour laiens qui ia estoit armes pour che que il lauoit ueu uenir. & cil qui morteument le haoit li demanda pour coi il auoit son seriant ochis. comment agloual ies tu dont che qui mon frere ochesis. que quil ait este de ton frere fait il iou te desfi. & sui agloual. lors descendi tout maintenant & traist lespee & li court sus & cil refait tout autre tel. si dura tant la bataille que li sires de laiens ne le pot soufrir si uait guenchissant cha & la & chil qui morteument le haoit le fiert si durement que pour escu ne pour hiaume ne remaint quil ne li enbate lespee iusquen la ceruele. & quant chil de

[1] MS, "dom."

laiens uirrent lor seignor mort il sen uont fuiant li uns cha & li autres la comme chil qui ont grant paour que agloual ne les ochie. & quant agloual uoit que il est mors. il le traine hors de laiens & le rue en vne fosse puis se remet en son chemin. quant perceuax fu montes & il ot pris son uallet qui mors estoit il le toursa sour son cheual deuant lui.

Atant se partent de laiens & enportent le uallet. qui mors estoit iusqua la premiere abeie que il trouerent si le fisent metre en tere tout maintenant puis se misent a la uoie & cheuaucent tant par lor iournees que il virrent a cardeul en gales. & li rois artus tint illeuc sa court le iour de la tousains. & tuit li compaignon de la table reonde de la queste estoient uenu laiens dolant & courechie fors que seulement li .iii. cousin. mais il nauoient rien trouue. quant li rois les uit il en fu mout lies & dist quil deuoient bien repairier car lonc tans auoit que il ne les auoit mais ueus. lors se regarde & uit les .xx. compaignons qui sestoient parti de court. quant il orent mangie il conterent lor auentures qui lor estoient auenues mais onques ni ot celui qui nouuieles seust adire de lancelot. dont li rois fu mout courechies & tout li baron. mais sour tous chiaus qui i estoient en pesa il a la roine. car bien sauoit que tous li maus que lancelot auoit estoit par lui si nen set que faire & nest nus aqui ele lost dire si en quide bien morir de doeul

Alen demain que agloual vint acourt regarda[1] [*fol. 153, col. b*] li rois en mi le palais si uit agloual & perceual qui seruoit as tables si demande li rois qui il estoit & on li dist. & il dist que diex li doinst boine auenture que moult estoit biaus. quant il orent mangie si vint agloual deval le roi & li dist sire li enfes dont uous parlastes est mes freres si le vous amaine pour faire cheualier car iou quit quil sera preudom. certes fait li rois uous aues moult bien fait & boin gre uous en sai. & iou le ferai mout uolentiers quant il vous plaira. & perceuaus li dist lors. sire dont uous pri iou que che soit demain. de par dieu soit che dist li rois. cele nuit ueilla percheuaus a la maistre eglise de cardoeul & alendemain le fist li rois cheualiers quant il fu heure de disner li rois vint el palais pour mangier. si sasisent li compaignon de la table reonde en lor sieges. & percheuaus sasist as tables auoec les moiens cheualiers & qui estoient mains renome. & quant il fu assis si uint deuant lui une damoisele la plus biele du monde mais onques nauoit parle. si lapieloient chil de laiens la damoisele qui onques ne menti & tout la connissoient par cest nom.

Quant la damoisele lot regarde vne grant pieche si commencha aplourer moult durement & lors en auint vne merueilleuse auenture qui fu tenue a miracle & si dut ele bien estre. car cele qui onques nauoit parle dist a percheual. perceual serians ihesucrist uirges & nes. vient ent seoir a la table reonde iouste le lieu perilleus. & chil qui chou oirent enfurent tout esbahi. adont le prist ele par la main & len mena au siege perillex & lasist a destre partie si li dist tout maintenant. en cest siege serra li boins

[1] MS, "regarrda."

cheualiers & tu serras les lui a destre pour chou que tu le resambleras de virginite. & a senestre serra boors si saront bien li cheualier de chaiens la senefianche de ceste cose.

Quant ele ot che fait ele dist biaus amis souuiegne vous de moi quant uous venres deuant le saint graal si proies pour moi car ie trespasserai de cest sieucle. atant sen part si vint es chambres la roine si se coucha ne onques puis ne parla fors au quart iour seulement que on li aporta corpuis domini. & quant ele le vit si dist. biaus sire dieux merchi ne onques plus ne dist. ains trespassa ains tost comme ele ot rechut son sauueour. si le tinrent a grant merueille chil de laiens comment che pooit estre auenu. si fisent si grant honor au cors [*fol. 153, col. c, verso*] con on deuoit faire a feme de son lignage si la misent en la maistre eglise de tintaguel moult hounourablement.

Quant la damoisele fu enterree si misent cele auenture en escrit pour cou que cil la ramenteuroient qui apres lor mort uenroient si retinrent o eus perceual si li fisent moult grant hounour & disent quil seroit de la table reonde & seroit auant mis pour les auentures metre afin. & le fisent remanoir ou il uausist ou non. mais plus uolentiers fust ales querre lancelot. quant il oi parler de sa cheualerie quil ne fust remes laiens. mais agloual & li autre compaignon le detinrent en tel maniere que li contes ne dist mie quil se fust meus acel point ains fust demoures mout grant pieche se ne fust vne parole qui li fu dite. si vous dirai quele.

Vn iour auint que li rois seiornoit ataradigant son castiel si sasist au disner. si seoient deuant lui ne sai quant cheualier & par deuant lui seruoient .iii. cheualier qui estoient de diuers aages. li uns de .xxiii. ans & li autres de .xl. li tiers de .xxiiii. ans & des plus iouenes estoit perceuaus & auoit la chiere simple. & kex li seneseaus qui longement lauoit regarde le moustre amordret si li demande quil len samble & il dist quil est boins cheualiers & quil aime miex pais que guerre. certes fait kex si fait il au mien ensiant. il pert bien a son escu que onques ni ot coup feru. ceste parole oi uns faus de la court qui dist a perceual que il ne deust mie seoir entre cheualiers. or me di fait perceuaus comment le ses tu. enondieu fait cil chil de chaiens dient que en uostre escu not onques coup feru. de cou oit percheuaus trop grant honte si li demande qui sont chil qui ce ont dit & il ne li set dire fors tant que il sont cheualier de la table reonde & ne pourquant il li mostre keu & mordret & il croit bien que che soient il qui ont ceste parole dite. si pense que acourt ne remanra il mie. ains enterra en la queste de lancelot. ne iamais ne retournera deuant chou que il sara nouieles de sa vie ou de sa mort se li est auis que che sera grans honors se il muert en la queste de si preudoume comme lancelot a este.

A ceste cose pense mout longement percheual au soir. quant agloual fu couchies vint percheual a .i. sien [*fol. 153, col. d, verso*] escuier & li

dist que il li apareillast ses armes & son cheual. si mait diex fait li ualles iou seroie mors & hounis se iou en ceste sale demouroie apres uous car uostre frere mochirroit. mais sil uous plaisoit que iou alaisse od uous iou le uous apareilleroie maintenant. ua dont tost fait perceuaus car moult me tarde que tu aies fait. quant percheuaus fu armes il monte entre lui & son escuier. & prent son escu & son glaiue & se partent de laiens. & quant il sont hors du castiel il se metent au chemin si cheuauchierent tant que il virrent en la forest. & quant il ont bien ceuauchie .x. lieues engleskes si trouerent vne maison qui estoit uielle & gaste & anchiene. lors dist perceuax a lescuier quil auoit grant talent de dormir. sire fait li escuiers or uous reposes & iou vous garderai iusqual iour. & perceuaus li dist lors ains dormiras ausi en as tu mestier

Lors li dist perceuaus quil atachast les cheuax & sen dormi. quant percheuaus uoit cil[1] qui est ensi endormis il pense que iamais nel porra miex laissier apoint. car il na plus afaire de sa compaignie. car che quil fera des ore mais ueut il faire si celeement que nus ne le sache comme chil qui bee auenir a mout grant renommee. lors monta sour son cheual & laissa son escuier dormant & erra tant que il vint hors de la forest. au matin commencha a plouuoir & afaire mout lait tans & iuers estoit ia entres si dura chis lais tans iusqua prime. & lors se regarda si uit .i. chastel deuant lui qui seoit sour vne yauwe qui mout estoit grande & pereilleuse. & percheuaus se regarde si vit sour le pont vn cheualier qui estoit armes & estoit loies dune chaine de fer parmi le uentre si fort que cestoit merueille si fu la chaine atachie a vn perron par deuers le chastiel. & quant chil a la kaine uoit uenir percheuaus uers le perron & uers le castiel. il li dist ha˜ por dieu se tu ies cheualiers de la maison le roi artu ou cheualiers auentureus si me uien ieter de chi & tu le dois bien faire car ausi sui iou cheualiers comme tu ies

Quant percheual uoit le cheualier il uait cele part & li dist que de ce ne li faura il mie si li demande comment il li porra aidier. en on dieu fait il se vous auies si boine espee que uous peussies ceste chaine trenchier iou seroie deliures & autrement non. & il dist que ia pour espee ne remanra sele deuoit brisier en .ii. piechies. lors le fist li cheualiers aprochier du pont & il li demande comment il la porra trenchier enon dieu fait il res ares de uostre hauberch. car se [*fol. 154, col. α*] autrement le faisies uous series enchaines. chil se couche maintenant & chil trait lespee & fiert sour le chaine & sour le perron en teil maniere quil caupa deuant lui & le chaine & le hauberch & pour .i. poi quil nafola le chevalier & fu deuant lui tout decoupe ausi comme vns monchiaus de terre.

Quant li cheualiers uit tel coup il se seigna puis dist. errant au ferir ne resambles mie hom mais anemis. mais iou quit que uous aues uostre espee quassee. & il dist que il quide bien que il die uoir. lors le drece

[1] "uoit cil" not in MS.

contremont si le troeue saine & entiere. si en fu mout lies car il laime ore miex que deuant lors uit du castiel issir vn cheualier arme dunes mout boines armes. & quant percheuaus le uoit uenir il point contre lui & laconsieus alentree dune des portes qui estoient sour le pont si le fiert si durement que il le porte a tere en liauwe tout enuers. si fust noies sans faute. mais il se prist a vne nacele qui en liaue estoit. & percheuaus prent le cheual & le done au cheualier que il auoit deliure & li dist que il montast desus. car il le menra a sauuete se il puet & chil monte si ne retornerent mie uers le castel ains sen uont dautre part.

Lors li demande percheuaus comment il auoit este enchaines. & chil li dist. sire fait il. il mauint auant ier que iou ceuauchoie auentures querant tant quauenture & fortune mamena cha. & quant iou fu illeuc herbergies la dame me uit biel che li fu auis quele me requist damors & iou li dis que iou nen feroie rien se ele ne sen uenoit od moi. & ele le me creanta. si auint que quant nous issismes de laiens & nous nous enpartesimes pour aler el roiaume de logres. & chil qui laiens estoient nous prisent & nous ramenerent arriere. si misent la dame es aniaus & moi loiierent si con uous ueistes si disent que ia amangier ne mi donroient ne ni mourroie se de faim non. & iou imouruisse uoirement se dieux ne vous eust ceste part amene pour moi aidier. or vous ai di pour coi. or me dites biaus amis fait percheual comment aues vous non. & chil dist quil li dira moult uolentiers. sire fait il iou sui de la table reonde & sui nies le roi baudemagu & iai non patrides. sire fait patrides estes vous des cheualiers de la table reonde. oil fait il uoirement ensui iou si li deuise comment il

Or le fu
r me dites fait il comment aues uous non. on mapiele fait il percheual & sui freres agloual [*fol. 154, col. b*] & pour coi fait patrides uous partesistes vous de court en yuer & il li dist maintenant que kiex & mordres len fisent partir par vne parole que il disent si li conta quele. Tant ont erre quil virrent au rechet dun cheualier. quant il furent pres patrides dist a son conpaignon. sire descendes car chi seres uous herbergies pour lamour de moi & pour che que deserui laues & il dist quil ne descenderoit pas. sire fait patrides si feres car vous ne mangastes hui & il en est bien tans si comme hom qui hui ne mania si len pria tant que il descendi.

Quant chil de laiens counurent patrides il li fisent moult grant ioie. & moult honorerent percheual pour lamour de lui. quant il orent mangie si demande percheuaus a patrides sil iroit point a la court le roi artu. oil fait il se dieu plaist. or uous proi iou dont fait il que uous me salues mon frere agloual & li dites que il ne me quire mie. car iou me sui partis de court pour oir noueles de lancelot. & il dist que cest mesage fera il bien. lors sen parti patrides & entra en son chemin & erra tant par ses iornees que il vint a la court le roi artu. si le salua de par perceual & li dist tout cou que il li a uoit dit & pour coi il sestoit partis de court.

quant li rois sot quil sen estoit ensi ales de cort il en sot mout maugre a keu & a mordret. seignor uous maues tolu le meillour cheualier de chaiens fors Gauaine mon neueu. & sachies que li cheualiers uenra a plus grant honor que uous ne quidies. & pour chou me poise il que il se part dechaiens deuant chou que il fust plus fors & plus durs. car des ore mais li conuenra plus soufrir paines & trauaus qua son aage napartenist. mais atant laist ore li contes a parler daus tos & retourne a percheual & a hestor des mares.

Or dist li contes chi endroit & la uraie estoire le tesmoingne que tant cheuaucha percheuax par maintes iournees esprouant soi quil li auint si bien que onques ne troua cheualier dont il ne uenist audeseure & si estoit mout acoustumes doir messe & matines cascun iour & se tenoit castement & se confessoit cascune semaine & mena tel uie tant quil ot bien erre .i. an entier. & en chel tempoire ot fait des plus bieles cheualeries del monde & fu de lui mout grant renomee [*fol. 154, col. c, verso*] & plus en la court le roi artu que en autre lieu car illeuques uenoient toutes les nouieles des preudomes.

Quant perceuaus ot bien erre .i. an en tel maniere si li auint .i. iour quil encontra hector des mares a lentree dune forest qui tex estoit atournes que toutes ses armes ne ualoient se petit non car ses escus estoit si depechies quil ni paroit se troucous non & ses hiaumes estoit si desfroissies & il estoit mout traueillies & che nestoit mie merueille. car il auoit cheuaucie .ii. ans tous entiers sans auoir point de repos. se cheuauchoit mout pensant & mout li anuioit. car il ne pooit riens trouuer dont il se reconfortast & ne pooit oir nouieles de lancelot son frere. si en estoit mout dolans si que il ne quidoit iamais auoir ioie. & quant il sentraprochierent il ne sentrecounurent point. car onques mais ne sestoient entreueu. il enbrachierent les escus & fisent samblant de iouster. il orent boins glaiues & fors. si sentrefierent si durement es grans aleures des cheuaus que onques lor hauberch ne lor furent garant quil ne sen feissent sentir les fers des glaiues es cars nues. mais il nauoient plaies dont il ne peussent bien garir & hector qui plus biax iioustoit que nus cheualiers porta percheuaus a tere par desur la crupe du cheual. puis prent le cheual & latache a vn arbre. & perceuaus qui mout fu courechies de cest encontre car puis que il fu cheualiers ne trouua mais cheualier qui la siele li peust faire widier. lors trait lespee du fuerre & enbrache lescu & sapareilla de moustrer sa uertu & sa proueche car il a trouue cou li est auis .i. boin cheulier si li court sus tout maintenant. & chil qui de cel mestier nestoit mie aprentis & qui acoustume lauoit des enfanche li done parmi le hiaume si grant coup comme il puet amener contreual. & percheuaus qui mout angoiseusement feroit quanquil ataignoit & nestoit mie si traueillies comme hestor. hauche le branc dachier & li paie teus

.iii. coups que mout fu chil greues du recheuoir car moult furent greues.

Lors commencha la mellee si grans entreus que nus ne les ueist qui ne les tenist a preudomes. [*fol. 154, col. d, verso*] si sen esmerueilla mout cascuns de la proece quil trouua en son compaignon. car hector ne quidast iamais trouer tant de proueche en perceual & percheuaus ne quidast iamais trouuer auteil cheualier comme hector li samble. & pour chou ni a il celui qui nait paour de la teste perdre. & ne pourquant il se desfendent mout bien andui & se ceuurent de lor escus pour les cols de lor espees qui estoient trenchans. si enfont le sanc uoler de toutes pars si dura tant la bataille quil ni a celui deus .ii. qui nait teus .x. plaies el cors que uns autres cheualiers en quidast bien mourir de la menor. si pert bien a la tere par ou il passent qui toute estoit couuerte de pieches descus & de mailles de hauberc & del sanc de lor cors que sil ne fuissent de si grant forche il fuissent piecha mort au grant trauail quil ont soufert. mais li grans desiriers que cascuns a de lui uengier. a cou quil estoient ausi conme naure amort les a teus menes que il nel sentent mais. mais tant ont endure que petit peuent mais lor coup ualoir. & quant il se quident entreferir si leur tournent les espees es mains mais il ni auoit celui qui deist mot pour cose qui li auenist. si maintinrent tant la bataille que par fine force les couuint reposer & traire arriere li uns cha & li autres la. si lor couuint reprendre lor alaines & lor forches qui lor faloient

Quant il se sont grant pieche regarde. si dist percheuaus a hestor dites moi qui uous estes sire cheualiers iou le uauroie mout uolentiers sauoir. car onques en ma vie ne trouuai ausi preudome comme uous estes ne que iou autant doutaisse car a che maues mene ou onques cheualiers ne me mena. certes sire fait hector ausi aues vous fait moi. car uous maues si court tenu que iou nen puis escaper sans mort par coi iou di que uous estes li mieudres cheualiers que iou onques trouuaisse passe a .iii. ans si uous porres bien uanter quant uous maures mort que uous aures mort hector des mares qui est compains de la table reonde & frere mon seignor lancelot du lac. haꝰ sire pour dieu merchi puis que vous estes conpains de la table reonde iou ai trop mesfait uers uous car ausi ensi en sui iou compains par coi iou ne me deusse estre combatus a uous en nule maniere & de cest mesfait vous cri iou merchi. car se iou quidaisse que de cel ostel fuisies ia ne mi fuisse conbatus en nule maniere [*fol. 155, col. a*] comment fait hector estes uous compains de la table reonde. sire oil & comment aues uous non. on mapiele fait il percheual & sui freres agloual. haꝰ sire con grant mesauenture a chi pour poi que nous ne nous sommes entrochis. sire fait percheuaus se uous uous plaingnies de moi encor me plaing iou plus de uous. car uous maues ochis & bien en porres sauoir le uoir.

Ensi se plaint li uns de lautre si ont mout grant pitie deus meesmes quant il se uoient que de plaies que de sanc teus atournes quil ne

quident ia la nuit ueoir. & hector osta son hiaume de sa teste teus comme il estoit. lors se coucha sour son escu & commencha adire tout enplourant. haᵛ sire lancelot. iamais ne me uerres. hui faura la compaignie de moi & de uous. grant pechie fist ma dame la roine qui uous cacha de court car pour uous morront maint preudome & iou meesmes en morrai qui mout vous desirroie a ueoir & a trouuer sour tous homes & ce nestoit mie merueille car plus procains uous estoie iou que nus. entrementes quil parloient ensi se regarda percheuaus & uit hector qui tant auoit perdu del sanc quil ne se pooit[1] soustenir si nest mie mains dolans destor pour lui meesme. quant percheuaus ot grant pieche ieu a tere il dist a hector sire uous maues[1] mort & diex le uous pardoinst & iou si fais. car se diex mait iou ne uous en sai nul mal gre puis que vous laues fait par mescounisanche. mais dites moi comment il uous est. par mon chief dist hector iou ne quit mie uiure iusca la nuit. car tant ai petites plaies & grans que iou nen puis escaper sans mort si me poise moult de moi & de uous. car onques mais cheualier qui deussent estre ami ne moururent en tel maniere car par la compaignie de la table reonde deussons nous estre ausi comme frere.

En tel maniere[2] iurent li uns cha & li autres la iusca heure de vespres. & lors dist hector a percheual. sire montes sour uostre cheual & ales chi pres a destre en ceste forest ou uous troueres vn hermite & li dires que il nous viegne veoir & aport od lui nostre sauueour. car onques mais iou noi tel paour con iai maintenant. si mait diex dist percheuaus iou nen ai pooir. car iou ne quit mie que iamais puisse monter sour cheual. ensi furent li dui cheualier ensamble tant que la nuit uint noire & oscure & fu li tans si oscurchis. que nus ne pot ueoir lautre. & hector dist a percheual iou me muir pour dieu se vous poes iamais uenir a [*fol. 155, col. b*] court & uous uees lancelot mon frere si le me salues. mais de conter ma mort ne ma mesceanche ne uous caille car il uous ensaroit malgre & atort & il dist que de cel message faire nara il iamais lisir. car il ne quide iamais ueir le iour de demain

Ai cel point quil estoient en teil peril que il quidoient bien mourir virront uers eus uenir vne clarte mout grande qui sour aus descendi si sesmerueillierent mout que ce pot estre. lors se regarderent & virrent uenir .i. uaissiel[3] qui estoit fais en samblance de galice qui fu couuers dun blanc samit & deuant uenoient doi encensier & doi autre le sieuoient apres. mais il ne ueoient mie qui les encensiers portoient ne qui le uaissiel soustenoit. & ne pourquant che leur sambloit sainte cose si iespererent tant de bien quil lenclinent parmi toutes les angoisses quil sentoient. & maintenant lor auint vne si bele auenture quil se sentirent sain & haitie & gari de toutes lor plaies que il auoient eues. apres ne demoura gaires que li sains uaissiaus sen parti si soudainement que il ne sorent quil fu deuenus.

[1] Small holes in MS. [2] MS has "manierent." [3] MS "uailliel."

Au chief de pieche parla percheual. & dist a hector aues vous che veu. oil uoir[1] fait il uoirement lai iou ueu mais iou ne sai mie bien que che est. & nepourquant si tost comme il fu uenus entour nous fui iou garis des plaies que vous mauies faites si que iou sui ausi sains & ausi haities con iou fui onques. par foi fait percheual. tout ensi uous puis iou dire demoi car vous ne me feistes hui plaie dont iou ne soie garis. enondieu uoirement nous a diex secourus par sa grace. & par sa pitie. car autrement neussons mie ueu le iour de demain. or poons nos bien dire que nostre sires a eu pitie de nous quant il nous a enuoie nostre garison par si biele auenture.

Longement parlerent ensamble de ceste cose si demanda li uns alautre de ceste cose que che pooit estre quil auoient ueu deuant eus. certes fait percheuaus iou endroit de moi ne puis sauoir que cest. & iou le uos dirai fait hector puis que vous ne le saues. sacies uraiement que chou a este li sains graaus. si est li uaissiaus ou nostre sires manga laigniel le iour de paskes auoec les desciples en [*fol. 155, col. c, verso*] la maison symon le liepreus. lors li conta comment iosep dabarimachie lauoit aporte el roiaume de logres si en a on puis ueu teus miracles que par la grace de nostre seignor en ont este repeu si oir & encore en sont cascun iour le maisnie le roi pelles & seront tous iours tant comme il seiorneront en cest pais.

Par dieu me sire hector vous me contes merueilles fait percheual. & iou croi bien que che soit uoirs par la uertu de nostre seignor qui a este prouuee sour nous vous di iou que iamais ne serai aaise deuant que iou la uoie se hom morteus le puet ueoir. lors rendent graces & merchis a nostre seignour de cou que si biau miracle lor auoit fait si atendirent illeuc iusqual iour. au matin quant il virrent le iour se leuerent en estant & salerent entrebaisier si fianchierent li uns alautre que iamais li uns alautre ne fauroit ains seroient compaignon puis que ensamble ont este sane. si prendent lor armes teles comme eles estoient. car toutes uois ualoient il miex que sil fuissent desarme si quierent tant lor cheuax que il les treuuent. quant il furent monte si dist percheuaus que ferons nous. che quil uous plaira fait hector. iou queroie fait il mon seignour[1] lancelot. mon frere que iou ne vi .ii. ans a passes. ne encore nen puis iou oir nouuieles si en sui mout dolans car il estoit li mieudres cheualiers du monde & li plus biaus. comment fait percheual nen oistes uous puis parler certes fait hector nenil si ai iou plus grant fianche en sa vie que en sa mort car sil fust mors il ne peust estre que nous nen oissons aucunes nouuieles. ore alons donc fait percheuaus andui ensamble pour sauoir se diex nous menroit ou nous en oissons nouuieles. si se metent andoi ensamble au chemin. mais atant se taist ore li contes daus .ii. & retorne[2] a parler de mon seignor lancelot du lac

[1] Small holes in MS. [2] MS retorner.

Or dist li contes que quant lancelot se fu a che uenus quil ot del tout perdu le sens & le memore quil soloit auoir entel maniere quil ne sauoit quil faisoit ne ou il aloit si erra tant si nus comme il se parti de camaalot mainte iournee lune heure auant & lautre arriere si comme auenture le portoit [*fol. 155, col. d, verso*] si fu en poi deure tains du soleil & du halle & fu mout enpiries de ce que tant se traueilloit & petit mangoit si fu teus atournes ains que li premiers yuers fust passes quil nestoit hom qui deuant leust ueu qui le recouneust sil ne lauisast mout bien. vn iour diuer quil faisoit moult froit auint que auenture amena lancelot en braies & en chemise tous depechies a .ii. paueillons qui estoient tendu en vne praerie & en cel paueillon gisoit uns cheualiers & vne damoisele. deuant cel paueillon pendoit uns escus & .ii. glaiues iauoit apoiies & .ii. espees. il vint cele part & prent une des espees & le sache du fuerre puis commenche a ferir grans couls sour lescu & fist autel noise con se vint cheualier combatissent ensamble si depeche lescu & lenpire mout durement.

A cele noise & a cele tempeste que lancelot faisoit issi du paueillon vns nains & quant il voit celui qui depeche lescu il li uoloit lespee oster des mains car il ne quidoit mie que il fust si hors du sens comme il estoit il vint uers lui & laiert par le poing & le sache au plus roidement que il pot. mais[1] onques pour pooir que il eust ne li pot oster du poing. & chil qui estoit hors[1] du sens se coureche & le prent par les espaules & le iete ensus de lui si felenessement que a poi quil ne li a le col brise mais plus de mal ne li fist & puis recommenche a ferir sour lescu si comme il auoit fait deuant. quant li nains fu flatis contre terre il ot si grant paour quil commencha a crier aide aide. si ne demoura gaires que de laiens issi vns cheualiers cauchies dunes heuses & uestus dune reube descarlate fourree mout ricement. & quant il uoit son nain il li demande que il a. sire dist li nains apoi que chil dyable ne ma tue. lors regarde li cheualiers lancelot qui se conbatoit a lescu & le uoit si mal atourne & si maluaisement uestu quil set bien quil nest mie bien en son sens. car il aloit nus en chemise ausi con sil fust plains estes.

Lors pensa li cheualiers que mout seroit grans aumosne qui le porroit faire reposer pour sauoir sil porroit uenir en son droit sens. lors senuait uers lui por lui oster lespee del poing. & lancelot commencha acrier sire cheualiers ne uenes mie auant mais laissies moi ma bataille car si mait diex se vous vous en entremetes iou uous ochirrai. lors hauche [*fol. 156, col. a*] lespee pour lui ferir. & quant chil le uoit il se tint arriere & sen uait a son paueillon & prent ses armes & sen reuint a lancelot. & li dist lors que il mesist ius lespee si imist sa main pour lui tolir. & lancelot hauce lespee si tost comme il le uit uenir pres de lui si le fiert si malement que lespee uole en .ii. pieces. & chil est si estourdis

[1] Small holes in MS.

quil chiet a tere teus atournes du coup que la ceruele li est toute tourblee en la teste. & lancelot le laissa gisant si entra el paueillon & trouua la damoisele qui ia estoit esueillie. quant ele le uit uenir si uit que il estoit hors du sens. lors sescria si haut comme ele pot & ist du lit toute nue en sa chemise & ua hors du paueillon & lancelot entra tantost ou lit. si le troue caut & boin si li fu auis achou quil auoit eu froit que il fust aaise si se coucha & couuri moult bien. & cele qui fu hors saillie troua son ami gisant a terre si quida bien quil fust mors si ses cria & dist. haᵛ lasse morte sui. lors commencha a faire le plus grant doeul du monde.

Au chief de pieche reuint chil destourdisons & se drecha en estant & ouri ses iex. & quant il ot celi qui ensi se dolisoit. il se blasme mout & demande ou chil iert qui ensi lauoit atourne. haᵛ sire fait li nains pour coi le demandes uous pour dieu ne li faites nul mal car che seroit mout grans pechies car il est fols & hors du sens. enondieu fait il ia se dieu plaist mal ne li ferai ains le retenrai od moi se dieu plaist tant que il sera garis & respasses. & se iou le pooie faire iou en seroie seruis & hounoures de plusours gens. si naurai iamais ioie deuant cou que iou laurai mis en son droit sens. parfoi sire fait la damoisele il est en cest paueillon. & cil se drece maintenant & uait cele part. & quant il vint a lentree del paueillon si vit lancelot. qui sestoit couchies el lit & dormoit mout fermement comme chil qui mout estoit traueillies si fu li preudom mout lies quant il le uit a repos. si entra ens tout bielement & prist la robe a la damoisele si laporta fors puis dist au nain. la si monte sour ton ronchin & si ten ua erranment au castiel si di amon frere que il viegne parler amoi & si nel laist pas & chil fait son conmandement. si monta & se haste de tost aler tant que il vint au rechet au cheualier si fist son mesage & cil prist ses armes & sen vint a son frere

Li cheualiers qui uoloit tenir lancelot auoit non [*fol. 156, col. b*] blians & li autres estoit apieles celians si estoient boin cheualier & de haut afaire.

Quant celians fu uenus se li dist blians biaus frere iou vous ai mande pour une des plus bieles auentures del monde qui mest auenue si li conta comment vns hom hors du sens est cele part uenus el plus poure habit du monde si sest grant pieche conbatus a mon escu. & quant iou li courus[1] sus pour lescu tolir il me douna si grant coup sour mon hiaume que onques puis que iou fui cheualiers ne rechui si grant pour[2] nul home & pour chou uous mandai iou pour moi conseillier que iou en porroie faire car iou le uoeil tenir od moi tant quil ait sante en aucune maniere parfoi biau frere iou ne vous en sai conseillier. car qui de sa sante se uauroit entrementre il le couuerroit metre en .i. lieu en recoi & loing de gent ou il neust nule lumiere enondieu fait blians se nous peussons tant faire que nous leussons en uostre fortereche ou en la moie si le porrions bien

[1] MS "courut." [2] ? "par."

porter. or pensons que il isoit portes se il puet estre. lors entrent el paueillon si uoient lancelot qui encore dormoit mout fortment. comme chil qui mais piecha nauoit eu tant de repos. quant il uoient chou si dient que il le lieront el lit de cordes & de caines si quil ne se porra remouuoir deuant che que il sesueillera.

ENsi comme il le disent le fisent car il le lierent si fort que apaines en peust nus hom escaper sil ne fust de trop grant pooir. & quant il orent che fait si manderent escuiers & serians & dient que il lenporteront en la forterece bliant. & chil sen uont atout le lit & il dormoit mout coiement car mout auoit eus de maus. quant il fu uenus a repos si dormi si fermement quil ne sesueilla onques deuant che quil fu uenus al rechet. mais en che quil fu mis atere sesueilla & ouuri ses iex & se uaut deslier mais che ne pot estre. & chil li deslient les mains puis li donent amangier & il manga comme chil qui piecha nauoit eu se mal non. si le tint blians entel maniere tout le remanant deliuer auoec lui. mais onques pour cose que il peust faire ne pot uenir agarison & nepourquant il lor sambla tant paisieubles que il li quisent reube riche & le laisierent ensi aler entreus en tel maniere que il niert point enprisones fors duns petis aneles que il li [*fol. 156, col. c, verso*] li misent es poins & es pies pour chou que il nalast mie loing. ensi amenda mout en cel terme & reuint auques en sa biaute mais onques ne uint nus laiens qui connoistre le peust & nepourquant disoient quil sambloit quil eust este mout boins cheualiers si estoient mout dolant de sa maladie que il ne len pooient trouuer garison. ensi fu lancelot laiens iusqua leste & tant que li estes fu hors iusquen uers le noel ne ia a cel point ne se fust remues se ne fust une auenture qui auint si uous dirai quele.

VN iour quil faisoit froit leua blians par matin & ot prises ses armes & fu montes sour son cheual & se parti de son chastiel ensi armes comme il estoit & baoit a aler en la forest qui pres dilleuc estoit pour iouste querre pour sauoir sil trouueroit aucun cheualier ou priue ou estrange & il estoit acoustumes de che comme chil qui estoit uns des meillours cheualiers du pais. & quant il fu un petit eslongies il trouua .ii. cheualiers freres qui ne estoient du pais & le haoient morteument. & quant il le uoient seul il li escrient quil estoit mors si laissent courre tant con cheual peuent courre. & blians qui mout estoit preudons ne faisoit mie sanblant de fuir ains les atent & chil brisent lor lanches sour lui. mais de la sele nel remuent & il enfiert .i. si durement quil li brise son glaiue contre son pis. mais autre mal ne li fait.

CIl passent outre & traient les espees & li courent sus & il se desfent & se coeure de son escu & lor doune grans couls. mais cil doi furent boin cheualier. & sentraident comme frere de si grant force que il li couuint place guerpir ou mourir maintenant & ce ne fu mie merueille sil lor tourna le dos car il lauoient naure en plusours lieus & tant a perdu

du sanc que mout fu afebloies. quant il uoient que il sest mis a la fuie si commencent acrier hai ˜ cuuers ni garires ia uostre fuie ne uous uaura. mais chil qui estoit sour .i. fort cheual sescapa mout bien de lor mains si quil nel poient onques baillier ains sen fui a son rechet. si ne trouua qui aidier li peust & chil qui pour occhirre le sieuoient entre [*fol. 156, col. d, verso*] rent apres lui. & tant quil virrent en vne chambre ou lancelot gisoit tous uestus & se fierent sour celui que il cachoient & quant il uoit quil ne pooit garir il met main a lespee & sapareille de lui desfendre comme chil quine se laira pas occirre tant comme il se puist desfendre & chil qui mout sont lie quant il le uoient laiens & ni uoient home qui li puist aidier & uoient quil sont doi & il est tous seus il vienent alui & lassalent & il se desfent tant comme il puet. mais tant auoit este greues a lautre assaut que moult auoit perdu de sa forche si a grant paour quil ne lochient.

Quant lancelot uoit la mellee commenchie deuant lui tous fuist il hors du sens & fox si connut il bien bliant qui maint bien li auoit fait & bien set quil le uoelent occirre si en est tant courechies que il uaut saillir en pies pour lui aidier. quant il uit que li aniel de ses pies le blechoient il sareste mout courechies & prent les aniaus a .ii. mains & les tire de toute sa forche si quil les. deront & en deliure ses pies. mais il en a les mains toutes sanglentes & le quir de ses dois tout deronpu[1] quil ot fait. & quant il ot les aniaus rompus il not mie tant de sens que il presist espee ne escu dont il se peust garandir car en la chambre en auoit a plente. ains court tous desarmes a vn des cheualiers & le prent par le hiaume & le tire si fort alui que il labat contre tere si lahert au poing si li[2] tout lespee & len done .i. grant coup par mi le hiaume & lochist puis court sus alautre & le fiert si durement que armeure nule quil eust nel garandist quil ne li mete lespee iusca la char. & quant chil le uit uenir il sesmerueilla mout durement dont che pooit estre uenu. & nepourquant pour che que il feru lauoit il sen uoloit uengier. si hauche lespee por lui ferir parmi la teste mais blians ne li laisse mie. ains hauche lespee & li coupe le brach. & quant chil se uoit si mal mene il tourne enfuies. & lautres que lancelot auoit abatu quant il uoit la desconfiture tournee sour eus il se fiert en la chambre & prent son cheual & monte & ausi fist ses freres. car paour ont de pis auoir si senuont por lor vies garandir & lancelot remaint laiens & se couche en son lit. & blians qui mout iert dolans de ceste auenture se desarme quant il uoit que il sen estoient ale. si atent tant que li seriant vienent [*fol. 157, col. a*] qui encore ne sauoient rien de ceste auenture ne rien nen dist laiens deuant le soir que ses freres vint. il fist cele nuit lancelot mangier od lui. en ce quil seoient au mangier celinans regarde & uit la nape toute sanglente du sanc qui des mains lancelot issoit comme chil qui auoit le cuir de ses mains tout deronpu. si le moustre a bliant uees biaus frere con uostre ostes a les mains derompues

1 ? "de cou" omitted. 2 ? "esrache" or "coupe" omitted.

C & saine mout malement grant pechie fist qui si estroitement le lia. Certes fait blians iou ne men merueil mie car onques mais ne vi a home deshaitie tant faire comme il a fait au iour dui & si vous dirai bien quele. lors li conta comment li doi frere lauoient enchauchie & ocis meusent fait il se il ne fust qui pour moi rescorre rompi ses aniaus par la forche quil auoit es mains si toli a .i. des cheualiers sespee & ochis les eust se il ne sen fuissent fui si eusse este mors se sa prouece ne mi eust aidie quant celians oi cele nouele il sesmerueilla mout de cele auenture si li dist lors ha˘ diex quel damage que il nest en son droit sens. certes iou ne kerroie mie que il ne fust vns des meillours cheualiers del monde. ensi parloient de lancelot & lor poise que il ne seuent que il est. & li sires de laiens dist que il ne le meteroit iamais en fers ne en buies. car il se tient asses en pais. & sans faille il iert ausi cois con sil fust en son droit sens. mais ce lochioit quil ne beuoit nene mangoit & cestoit ce qui plus le tenoit en sa maladie. deus ans fu lancelot auoec bliant tant quil ot si perdu le sens quil[1] ne[1] sauoit[1] quil faisoit. ne onques dedens cel terme ne vint laiens qui le conneust. ne il ne sorent onques son non car il meesmes nel sauoit mie.

A lentree dyuer auint que par deuant la tour ou il gisoit passoit uns pors sauuages & apres uenoient chien plusour qui prendre le uoloient mais il se desfendoit moult durement & lor liura souuent estal. & apres les chiens uenoient ueneour. quant chil[2] qui estoit en la tour uit passer le porc qui sen aloit en tel maniere il li prist talens daler apres. il descent & vient a la porte si trouua .i. cheual ensele & .i. glaiue apoiiet contre le mur & vne espee pendant a larchon de la sele. il vient au cheual & monte sus. entel maniere senuait apres le porc tant comme il pot esperouner & se feri en la forest la ou il la vit plus espesse & sieut le porc criant & semo-[*fol. 157, col. b*]nant les chiens tant comme il puet si a tant ale en tel maniere quil vint en vne ualee

L ors saresta li pors & commencha a liurer estal as chiens & sen ochist plusours en poi deure & lancelot qui uenoit apres le glaiue alongie fiert le porc si durement en lespaule senestre que li glaiues uole en pieches. mais il nel blecha mie granment. & li pors qui fu aires & caus fiert le cheual parmi les flans si quil le porfent tout mort enmi le chemin & lancelot saut sus & a tant de sens quil a trait le branc du fuerre & li pors li aceurt si li met le dent parmi la quisse & li fait plaie grant & lancelot le fiert parmi la teste si grant coup quil li fait la ceruele espandre si labat mort & si se sent[3] tel atourne de la plaie que il a que il ne puet aler auant ne arriere ains se sent asses angoissos si sasist desous .i. arbre & nauoit mie tant de sens que il estancast sa plaie que ele ne sainast trop.

Q uant uint a heure de none si auint que deuant lui passa vns hermites qui mout estoit preudom & quant il vit le porc mort & les chiens

[1] Repeated in MS. [2] MS "chi." [3] MS not quite distinct.

en tour lui plus de .iii. & vit lancelot qui gisoit naures desous .i. arbre. il vint tantost cele part & le salua & cil qui ne sauoit nul bien ne sona mot & li preudom li demanda quil auoit & il li dist tantost quil estoit naures. sire fait li preudom qui vous a che fait & cil est tant nices que il ne li set dire fors que li pors le morst. enondieu fait li preudom vous estes mal baillis se vous ne troues qui vous ait car vous aues tant de uostre sanc perdu. & pour ce vous loeroie iou se vous le poies faire que vous uenissies iusca nostre maison qui est pres de chi. & illeuc se dieu plaist troueres vous garison de uostre maladie. fies de chi fait lancelot ales uos ent iou nai nul mal. ales uous ent ha[illegible] sire fait li preudom que che est che que vous dites se diex mait iou quit que vous estes mors

Quant lancelot uoit quil le tient longement en parole il li anuie mout. lors prist sespee qui les lui gisoit si[1] le hauce pour lui ferir & cil se trait arriere. & quant il uoit quil ne puet a lui auenir si li iete & le quide ferir parmi la teste. mais il faut pour che que li preudom guenchi. lors aperchut il que il estoit hors du sens si se part dilleuc & pense que il amenra gent auoec lui qui le porteront en son hermitage [*fol. 157, col. c, verso*] pour chou que preudom li sambloit si senuait iuscal recet dun cheualier si prent iusca .vi. serians & lor dist quil auoit trouue en cele forest le plus biau cheualier du monde qui un porc sauuage auoit ochis. si grans meschеanche li estoit auenue quil estoit hors du sens si croi que che li soit auenu puis que il fu naures. & pour chou uauroie iou sil uous plaisoit que uous le presissies par force & laportissies iusca nostre hermitage. si quil i peust garir. car sil demoroit gaires illeuc a ce que la saison est froide il ne porroit estre quil ne mourust. & che seroit trop grans damages. & chil dient que che feront il uolentiers. il uont la ou lancelot estoit & font vne biere cheualereche & le misent ens uausist ou non si lenporterent en tel maniere en lermitage au preudome. il auoit od lui .i. compaignon qui ot este cheualiers & mout sauoit de plaies garir si sentremist tant de lancelot pour dieu & pour carite que il fu tous garis ains que il eust .i. mois passe. mais pour la paine quil traioit & pour la poure viande que il nauoit mie a prise enpira il mout durement & fu pales & maigres & afebloies & mal vestus dont il fu plus mas & plus hors du sens quil nestoit deuant & se parti de laiens teus & mal uestus par la grant froidure dyuer si maigres & si chetis que apaines pust nus quidier que che fust lanchelos.

En tel maniere erra lancelot tant que il vint a corbenich & quant il entra el castiel li enfant & li garchon si tost comme il le virrent le counurent a fol & hors du sens si le commenchierent a batre & a ferir & a faire noise & grant oiee apres lui se le courchierent en tel maniere quil lor commencha a ieter pierres & tant quil en naura plusours cel iour & tant quil commencierent tout afuir deuant lui pour ce quil ne trouoit nul si fort quil ne debrisast tout alabatu & ence quil crioient & disoient

[1] MS "il."

foies fuies uees chi le fol si en fu cele parole[1] parmi le castiel que tuit le uenoient uenir & il ne demouroit en nul lieu ains aloit par toutes les voies[2] cachant les vns & les autres si trouua asses cel iour qui mal li fist. & tant que il ne pot mais soufrir lanui que il li faisoient ains lor entournoit le dos & senfui iusca la maistre fortereche du castel [*fol. 157, col. d, verso*] si entra dedens comme chil qui ne trouua qui lentree li deueast. car mout estoient li seriant de laiens cortois & de boinaire. a cele eure que on mangoit laiens ientra lancelot. & chascuns le commencha a apieler & il commencha a mangier comme chil qui auoit mout grant faim & quant il ot mangie il sala couchier el palais sour fuerre que il trouua. en tel maniere fu lonc tans que il ne fu couneus de nului & il ne se presissent iamais garde que che fust lancelot. & il ot a mangier & aboire a grant plente. & le reuestirent de lor vies dras li seriant de laiens. & pour ce & pour le repos que il troua amenda il mout en poi deure & reuint en sa biaute & en sa forche.

Vn iour apres paskes auint que li rois pelles ot fait dun sien cousin nouuiel cheualier & pour lamour de lui ot il doune reubes a plusors homes. & chil damoisiaus qui estoit cousins le roi amoit mout lancelot. & le tenoit ades od lui ne onques pour cose que il li ueist faire nel laissa. & si tost comme il fu cheualiers & il ot uestue sa reube il apiela .i. sien seriant & li dist ua moi querre le fol & quant il fu uenus il li dona sa reube & le fist uestir deuant lui. quant lancelot ot uestue la reube au cheualier il fu mout biaus si not laiens nul qui le ueist qui nen eust grant pitie si le plaignoient mout entreus & disoient que cestoit mout grant damages de lui quant si biaus cheualiers comme il estoit auoit perdu le sens & le memoire. & quant li rois le uit en tel reube si biele & si boine si dist a soi meesme quil ne croit pas quil nait este de haute gent estrais car moult bien le sambloit.

Cel iour entra lancelot en vn verger desus la tour qui mout iert biaus & plains derbes si auoit vne fontaine desous vn sicamor qui mout estoit bele & nete. & quant il fu uenus a la fontaine il en but & sen dormi deles si uestus comme il estoit & apres che ne demoura mie granment que uint[3] la fille au roi pelles cele pour cui lancelot auoit este cachies de court si mena auoec lui grant plente de damoiseles si commencierent a iuer & a caroler & a chanter les vns & les autres parmi le iarding si com damoiseles font maintes fois si comme eles commenchent a iouer auint que vne damoisele qui mout estoit de haut parage senbati sour lancelot qui dormoit sour la fontaine si en ot al premiers grant paor. mais puis saseura quant ele uit quil dormoit si aprocha de lui & le commencha a regarder & le vit tant bel & tant auenant que il li est auis que onques mais ne uit ausi bel home.

Quant ele lot esgarde grant pieche si sen retorna [*fol. 158, col. a*] a ses

[1] ? "porte" omitted. [2] ? Not legible. [3] Not in MS.

compaignes & le laissa dormant. & la ou ele uit le fille au roi pelles si li dist dame se uous uolies ueir le plus biel home del monde iou le uous mousterroie. mais iou ne uauroie que nus fors vous & ie le ueist pour che quil ne sesueillast. comment fait ele laues uous trouue dormant. oil fait ele les la fontaine. ore ialons dont entre nous .ii. car nus autres ne nous ifera conpaignie.

H. Oskar Sommer

Astolat, Camberley,
Surrey, England

FAMILIA GOLIAE

Probably no species of mediaeval Latin literature has aroused greater interest in modern scholars or been the subject of subtler researches than the Goliardic poetry of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. The reasons for this are many. In the first place, some of the poems are distinguished by real beauty and power; then, the spirit and attitude of which they are the expression are entirely at variance with the simple formulae in which glib generalizers dispose of the Middle Ages; moreover, questions regarding the vernacular poetry of the Middle Ages and the origins of modern versification thrust themselves forward as one reads this poetry and clamor for solution; and, finally, a host of mysterious inquiries arise to which as yet no satisfactory replies have been given—Who were the Goliardi, the familia Goliae? Why were they so called? Was the name chosen by them or imposed upon them by others? In what country did they originate? Who was the Primas, or Archipoeta?—questions, some of which have been discussed with no small amount of patriotic prejudice and national bias.

Not the least puzzling of these questions, though perhaps much the least important, is that regarding the origin of the name. There have been three principal theories: (1) that of Jacob Grimm,[1] who derives *Goliardi* from the Provençal *gualiar*, to deceive, through the form, *gualiador*, deceiver; (2) that of Thomas Wright,[2] who also looks upon *Goliardi* as anterior to *Golias*, and derives it from Latin *gula*, supposing the name to have been given to the *clerici ribaldi*, the *scholares vagi*, on account of their gluttony and intemperance; (3) that which regards *familia Goliae* as anterior to *Goliardi* and attempts in some way to account for the connection between the wandering scholars of the Middle Ages and the Philistine giant slain by David. Straccali[3] has shown that there are serious historical dif-

[1] *Kleinere Schriften*, III, p. 46.

[2] *The Latin Poems Commonly Attributed to Walter Mapes*, Introd., pp. x-xii.

[3] Alfredo Straccali, *I Goliardi, ovvero I Clerici Vagantes delle Università Medievali*, Firenze, 1880, pp. 47 f.

ficulties in the way of the theories of Grimm and Wright, but some recent authorities, including the *New English Dictionary*, have accepted that of Wright, apparently because no one has yet shown the connection demanded by the third theory. The fullest and best statement of the third theory is that of Giesebrecht:[1]

Der Bischof, Primas oder Erzbischof—denn auch diese Standesbezeichnungen erscheinen—ist also der Führer der Goliarden-Brüderschaft. Weshalb er aber just den Namen des Bischofs Golias trägt, ist bis jetzt völlig dunkel und möchte nur durch neues Material sich aufklären lassen. Ist dabei an die Goliath-Maske zu denken, die bei Processionen und Spiele des Mittelalters öfters vorkommt, oder ist es nur eine bramarbasirende Bezeichnung für das mächtige ideale Haupt des Vagantenstandes, oder steht es endlich in Bezug auf irgend eine besondere Bedeutung des Worts im Jargon der damaligen französischen Studenten, von dem wir auch sonst hier und da hören—darüber lassen sich nur Vermuthungen aufstellen.

Hubatsch,[2] after recognizing Golias as an ideal head for the order of Goliardi, rejects the derivations from the vernacular, saying:

Einfacher ist allerdings die Erklärung, wenn man alle Anklänge an die Vulgärsprachen abweist und annimmt, dass bei fahrenden Schülern, die nach der Sitte der Zeit und besonders als Cleriker gar nicht umhin konnten, für ihren Orden einen Patron gewissermassen als Schutzheiligen zu suchen, der Name des Golias, der auftauchte, beliebt ward und allgemeine Aufnahme fand, und sie nach ihm sich Goliarden nannten.

Straccali also, as I have just indicated, accepts the theory of the derivation from the biblical giant, but adds nothing to the guesses of Giesebrecht and Hubatsch concerning the cause or nature of the connection between the giant and the scholars. The new material which Giesebrecht regarded as necessary for the solution of the problem has not as yet been produced by anyone, for Traube's connection of the song of Goliath and David sung by the mimus in Sextus Amarcius[3] with the name Goliardi is far from convincing.

But, if no new material is available, there is some old material that has been overlooked which seems to afford the necessary explanation. In the modern breviaries of the Catholic church, the three lections of the first nocturn of the fourth Sunday after Pente-

[1] *Allgemeine Monatsschrift für Wissenschaft und Literatur*, Januar, 1853, p. 30.

[2] *Die lateinischen Vagantenlieder des Mittelalters*, Görlitz, 1870, pp. 15 f.

[3] *Sextus Amarcius*, ed. Manitius, I, ll. 403–43; cf. Traube, in *Anz. f. d. Alt.*, XV, p. 200.

cost consist of I Kings, 17: 1–16 (or I Samuel, as it is called in our English version), and the story of David and Goliath is continued in the lections of Monday (vss. 25, 26, 31–33, 34–36) and completed in those of Tuesday (vss. 38–40, 41–46, 48–51). This, of itself, is perhaps not significant, for the biblical story was in any event well known; but the significance of the following can hardly be doubted: the three lections of the second nocturn of this Sunday are drawn from a sermon ascribed to St. Augustine which deals with the story and makes of Goliath precisely the symbolic figure of which we are in search. The first of these lections (i. e., No. IV) begins thus:

Stabant filii Israel contra adversarios quadraginta diebus. Quadraginta dies, propter quatuor tempora, et quatuor partes orbis terrae, vitam praesentem significant, in qua contra Goliath, vel exercitum ejus, id est, contra diabolum et angelos ejus, Christianorum populus pugnare non desinit. Nec tamen vincere posset, nisi verus David Christus cum baculo, id est, cum crucis mysterio descendisset.

And in the third lection (No. VI) we find: "Venit enim verus David Christus, qui contra spiritalem Goliath, id est, contra diabolum pugnaturus, crucem suam ipse portavit."

We have here, it should seem, in a passage read regularly in the service of the church and authorized by the great name of St. Augustine, a type and a name singularly fitted to be applied by ecclesiastical authorities to that army of lawless vagabonds which they both feared and despised. Golias is not merely, as Giesebrecht and Straccali suggest, the symbol of titanic and ruthless power; he is, specifically, and on the highest authority, the type of spiritual wickedness, the leader in this present life of the army of evil ones.

There is also a passage in the second of the lections of this second nocturn of the fourth Sunday after Pentecost which may have emphasized in the minds of the churchmen the appropriateness of the symbolism.

Alligatus est enim, tamquam innexus canis catenis, et neminem potest mordere, nisi eum qui se illi mortifera securitate conjunxerit. . . . . Latrare potest, solicitare potest, mordere omnino non potest, nisi volentem. Non enim cogendo, sed suadendo nocet: nec extorquet a nobis consensum, sed petit.

The barking dog, unable to bite any but those who voluntarily put themselves within his reach, must have seemed to the devout singularly appropriate to these "ribaldi clerici, vagi scholares," who barked against the church, but were able to injure only those who willingly listened to their godless utterances.

Whether *familia* was suggested by the *exercitus* of the passage quoted above from the first lection of the second nocturn, or whether it was due to the biblical and talmudic accounts of the family of the giant, may admit of question. II Samuel (II Kings in the Vulgate) 21:16–22 tells of battles in which four giants were slain by David and his followers, one of them being mentioned as the brother of Goliath, another as having six fingers on each hand and six toes on each foot, and all as sons of "the giant in Gath" (or sons of Rapha, as the margin has it). No one reading the Vulgate could fail to recognize them as members of one family; vs. 22 reads: "Hi quatuor nati sunt de Arapha in Geth, et ceciderunt in manu David, et servorum ejus." The account of these brothers of Goliath is of course repeated, with slight differences, in I Chron. 20:4–8. In the Haggada of the Talmud, *Tractate Sota*, 132, we read (I quote Wünsche's translation, II, i, 332 f.):

> Warum hiess er Goliath? R. Jochanan hat gesagt: Weil er sich mit unverschämtem Gesichte vor den Heiligen, gebenedeiet sei er! hinstellte, denn es heisst I Sam. 17:8: Wählet unter euch einen Mann, dass er herabkomme zu mir. Unter Mann ist niemand anders als der Heilige, gebenedeiet sei er! zu verstehen. . . . . R. Jochanan hat im Namen des R. Meïr gesagt: An drei Stellen wurde jener Frevler durch seinen eignen Mund gefangen. . . . . Nach R. Jochanan war er der Sohn von hundert Vätern und einem Hunde.

With much more to the same effect, or worse. The rabbins further identified Rapha, the mother of Goliath and his brethren, with Orpah, the daughter-in-law of Naomi, who kissed her and went back to her people and her gods, when Ruth, the ancestress of David, "clave unto her;" cf. Ruth, chap. 1, esp. vss. 11–17, and *Tractate Sota*, 132, 133 (Wünsche, II, i, 332). That these bits of rabbinical lore were known to the churchmen of the Middle Ages, I have no proof; but the possibility that they were will not be doubted by anyone who has investigated the sources of

mediaeval exegesis and biblical legend, and learned to appreciate the constant influence of the Talmud upon them.

But even without the influence of the biblical and rabbinical lore concerning the family of Goliath, it is clear that the chapter of I Kings (or I Samuel) which furnished the lections of the first nocturn of the fourth Sunday after Pentecost, and the Augustinian Sermon which furnished the lections of the second nocturn of the same day, fully account for the application of the term familia Goliae as a term of reproach to the vagabond and recreant clerics of the Middle Ages. That the term was later accepted and the personality of Golias himself boldly assumed by satirists of the church is in entire harmony with the history of party names, the classical example being, perhaps, that of the Tories and Whigs of England (cf. *Century Dictionary*).

It remains only to show that the sermon quoted above was in use as a lection early enough to make possible the application assumed.

The sermon, though it still bears in the breviary the title, "Sermo Sancti Augustini Episcopi, Sermo 197 de Tempore," is, in fact, not by this saint, but by Caesarius of Arles (469–542).[1] It was, however, regarded as the work of St. Augustine throughout the Middle Ages, and, indeed, in modern times until the publication of the Benedictine edition of St. Augustine. I have as yet, with the sources of information at my command, been unable to learn exactly when it was first made an official part of the service of the church. The early liturgies and liturgical treatises that I have been able to examine are so vague upon such points as this as to make definite certainty impossible.[2] All the evidence I can procure, however, seems to indicate that this sermon has been read in the church in connection with I Kings, chap. 17, from a very early date, if not from the very time of its composition by Caesarius.

[1] Cf. Bäumer, *Geschichte des Breviers*, Freiburg i, B., 1895, p. 626, and Migne, *P. L.*, XXXIX, col. 1818; or Herzog, *Realencyclop.*, s. v. "Caesarius von Arles."

[2] I have examined all the liturgical documents and treatises published by Hittorp, Migne, Gerbertus, Bona, and Martène, as well as the discussions of the three last-mentioned scholars, and of course have consulted Bäumer, *Geschichte des Breviers*, and Batiffol, *Histoire du bréviaire romain*. As yet I have been unable to obtain access to any good mediaeval Sermologus.

In the first place, the books of Kings and Chronicles have from time immemorial been read in the night services of the Sundays and week-days "post Pentecosten." In the provinces, indeed, there seems to have been no very strict observance of the services of the nocturnal and diurnal hours even as late as the sixth century;[1] but St. Benedict prescribed that the monks of his order should at least once in the year read the whole of the Scriptures, together with suitable comments (sermons and homilies) by the most catholic and orthodox fathers.[2] The regulations of St. Benedict were apparently made the basis for the guidance of all the clergy by Gregory the Great.[3] At any rate, when Amalarius of Metz went to Rome in 832 to inquire into the liturgical practices there, the reply to a question on this point given by Archdeacon Theodore, who had been assigned by the pope to answer his inquiries, was, "In octavis Pentecostes incipimus legere librum Regum,"[4] and this information is abundantly confirmed for this and the following centuries by the evidence cited by Bäumer, pp. 279 ff. I will quote two authorities, not noted by Bäumer, which seem of special interest: *Ex Cod. San-Gallensi saec.* IX: "In tempore autem aestatis libri regum (leguntur), et parilipomenon usque ad medium autumni. . . . . Tractatus vero SS. Hieronymi, Ambrosii certerorumque Patrum, prout ordo poscit, leguntur."[5] And again, *Extractus ex Rituali Msc. saec. XIV, Ordinis Melitensis:*

Ab Octava Pentecostes usque ad Kal. Aug. leguntur libri regum, et cantatur *Praeparate* quoniam sicut Saul et David et alii pro lege sua alophilos et Goliam pugnaverunt sic et nos post pentec. i. postquam recepimus donum Spiritus sci. in baptismo pugnare debemus contra vicia et daemones. Unde Apostolus: non est nobis conluctatio adversus carnem et sanguinem: sed adversus principes, etc.[6]

[1] Cf. Bäumer, pp. 143–62, especially his discussion of the recently discovered *De cursu stellarum* of Gregory of Tours, on p. 162.

[2] Bäumer, *op. cit.*, pp. 170 ff., 273 f., and *Regula S. Benedicti*, p. 42.

[3] Bäumer, *op. cit.*, pp. 203–20. We need not enter into the controversy between Bäumer and Batiffol, as the conclusion can affect our problem in no essential respect.

[4] *De Ordine Antiph. Liber*, Prol., ap. Hittorp, *De Cath. Eccl. Divin. Offic.*, Rome, 1591, p. 225; cf. also Amalarius, *De Eccl. Offic.* IV, 71.

[5] Gerbertus, *Lit. Aleman.*, IV, p. 175.

[6] Gerbertus, IV, p. 182.

But not only were the lections from the Bible very early assigned to approximately the places they now occupy, the practice of devoting the second nocturn of Sunday to lections from a sermon on the portion of scripture read in the first nocturn was introduced as early as the time of St. Benedict and soon became invariable. Bäumer, speaking of the Rule of St. Benedict, says:

> Die Lesungen der ersten Nocturn sind aus der Heiligen Schrift, *in codice*, und zwar in der Regel (he is speaking of the whole year) aus dem Alten Testament zu nehmen; die der zweiten Nocturn entweder ebenfalls aus der Heiligen Schrift, oder aus den Commentaren, Homilien, und Sermonen der *nominatissimi et orthodoxi catholicique Patres;* die der dritten Nocturn aus dem Neuen Testament.[1]

In the third place, although I have, as I have said, been unable to learn at what date this sermon became a part of the service, I find that of the other sermons ascribed to St. Augustine, but really by St. Caesarius, some were in use as lections very early. Nine such sermons are given by Bäumer (624–30) in his list of "Sermone und Homilien, deren Verfasser unrichtig angegeben sind." Of these, two are recorded in the Homiliarius of Paulus Winfridus as occupying the same positions which they now occupy, viz., "Hom. xl. In Natali Sanctorum Innocentium (Ex. Opp. sancti Augustini) Hodie, fratres charissimi" and "Hom. cxxxvi. Dom. in Albis. Ad Neophytos (Ex Opp. beati Aug.) Paschalis Solemnitas, etc."[2]

It may be suggested that the silence of Paulus and the other authorities in regard to this particular sermon is against the supposition that it was in use in their day. But the argument *a silentio* is here even less trustworthy than usual, for these documents are far from exhaustive and, except in regard to the principal festivals, often most casual in their information; for example, the Ordo Romanus XI (before 1143) apparently has for the second nocturn of Innocents' Day the sermon given by Paulus Winfridus and still in the modern breviary, whereas it has no hint of the sermon for Low Sunday (Dominica in Albis), which, as we have just seen, is equally given by Paulus and by the modern breviary.

[1] Bäumer, *op. cit.*, p. 173; cf. also pp. 273 f., 276, 335, 341, etc.

[2] Migne, *P. L.*, xcv, coll. 1177, and 1338.

Finally, as was suggested at first, although Caesarius himself did not in the rule compiled for the monks of his cloister prescribe this sermon for official use, his disciple Cyprianus tells us in his life of St. Caesarius[1] that he chose and prepared sermons which he assigned to be read when he himself was not able to officiate, and these were used generally in his churches. But this is not necessary for our argument; it is enough that the evidence given above indicates that this sermon, which clearly establishes Golias as a symbolic figure of the highest significance, was from an early period a portion of the regular official service of the church, and as such necessarily impressed itself upon the minds of the clergy. It is hoped that someone more skilled in the history of the liturgy than the present writer may be able to point out when the sermon was first used for lections and whether its use was universal. Light might possibly be thus thrown upon the limits of time and space within which the terms familia Goliae, and Goliardi came into existence.

Before leaving the subject I should like to call attention to a curious circumstance which, so far as I know, has not been noted. In the genealogy of Pantagruel, as one of my students reminds me, Rabelais includes the name of Goliah twice. Certain features of the genealogy indicate that he either had in mind Golias as head of the familia Goliae or that he associated with giants in general the same ideas and practices that were, in the later Middle Ages, associated with the Goliardi. I quote the English translation, which renders the original accurately:

> Who begat Atlas, that with his shoulders kept the sky from falling; Who begat Goliah; Who begat Eryx, that invented the hocus pocus playes of Legerdemain; . . . . Who begat Gabbara, that was the first inventor of the drinking of healths; Who begat Goliah of Secondille; Who begat Offot, that was terribly well nosed for drinking at the barrel-head.

[1] Vita. Lib. I, Auct. Cypriano, Firmino et Viventio episcopis. cap. 5, 41; see also *ibid.*, §42: "Praedicationes quoque congruas festivitatibus et locis, sed et contra ebrietatis et libidinis malum . . . . diversorumque vitia fecit, easque ita paravit ut si quis advenientium peteret non solum non abnuerit impertire, sed et si, minime suggereret, ut deberet accipere, offeret tamen ei, ut importaret, ipseque legeret. Longe tamen positis in Francia, in Gallia, atque in Italia, et Hispania, diversisque provinciis constitutis transmisit per sacerdotes, quid in ecclesiis suis praedicare facerent, ut projectis rebus frivolis et caducis, juxta Apostolum bonorum operum fierent sectatores.—*Act. Sanct.* (Boll.) Aug., VI, 74.

The qualities here ascribed to Eryx and Gabbara are not mentioned elsewhere. The former name was suggested, I presume, by that boxer whom Hercules killed and whose seven-fold caestus Entellus brought to the fight with Dares, in the fifth book of the Aeneid; the latter is the name of the Arabian giant brought to Rome in the time of Claudius, as Pliny[1] tells us, and distinguished only for his great size. Is it only a coincidence that, like the Archipoeta, Rabelais shoots his arrows at the follies and corruptions of the time from behind the huge bulk of a loose-mannered giant?

JOHN MATTHEWS MANLY

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

[1] *Hist. Nat.*, VII, p. 16, where mention is also made of Secondilla.

THE LAY OF ELIDUC AND THE LEGEND OF THE HUSBAND WITH TWO WIVES

I

In the city of Erfurt in Thuringia there is preserved a sculptured stone, originally the top of a tomb showing the figure of a knight reclining between two women. Tradition has it that the central figure in this group represents a count of Gleichen, who had left his wife and children in 1227 to join the crusade of Frederic II. Made a prisoner, he became the slave of the Turkish sultan and would have remained so until his death, had not the daughter of the Mohammedan fallen in love with the handsome Christian and planned for his freedom on condition that he would marry her and lead her to his home. His answer that he had left a wife and children behind him made naturally no impression upon the young Mohammedan woman, who retorted that among the Turks it was customary for one husband to have two and even more wives. In this dilemma the count decided to accept her offer, to observe his marriage vow in fact though he broke it in form, and to appeal to the pope on his passage through Rome for pardon for his sin. According to his expectations the pope not only pardoned the deed but also authorized the continuance of the bigamous relation. Protected by this official sanction, he continued his journey to his home, and there the first wife, when she understood the service rendered to her husband in his captivity, accepted gladly and readily the newcomer and the count lived for many years in peace and joy with his two wives and was finally buried between them.[1]

The earliest mention of this tradition is found in the sixteenth century. There is evidence, however, that the legend itself of the husband with two wives is older, for we have a similar story in France, told with all the essential features, in a prose text of the

[1] Reineck, *Die Sage von der Doppelehe eines Grafen von Gleichen*, Sammlung gemeinverständlicher wissenchaftlicher Vorträge. Hrsg. von Virchow und Wattenbach, Heft 138, Hamburg, 1892; Bayot, *Le roman de Gillion de Trazegnies*, Louvain, 1903, pp. 80 ff.

fifteenth century, of a knight of the family of Trazegnies,[1] and this prose text in all probability derives from a lost poem of the fourteenth century.

Here also the story is attached to the tomb of a man buried between two women. The author relates that on a visit to the abbey *de l'Olive* in the Hainaut he saw three tombs, and upon inquiring for the names of the people buried there he learned that these were the tombs of Gillion de Trazegnies and his two wives. The abbot then gave him a book from which he translated his story, which is as follows:

Gillion was a knight of the court of the count of Hainaut, married to a cousin of the latter, Marie d'Ostrevant. Having no heir he made the vow to undertake a journey to the Holy Land if God would grant his prayer to give them a child, and when this wish was about to be realized, he set out on this pilgrimage even before the child had been born. He visited the Holy Sepulcher, but on the journey homeward fell into the hands of the sultan of Egypt, who led him to Babylon and held him prisoner for a period of twenty years. During that time he made himself indispensable to the sultan by his strength and power of leadership, and Gracienne, the daughter of the Saracen, attracted by his handsome appearance, fell in love with him and was instrumental in saving his life. Presently the sultan was attacked by Isidore de Damas, a rejected suitor for the hand of Gracienne, and Gillion managed to win a decisive victory for the sultan. Then Gracienne offered him her love and accepted the Christian faith, and when Gillion received what he had every reason to believe to be authentic information concerning the death of his wife, he married the Saracen girl. But Marie d'Ostrevant had not died. She had given birth to twins, and when these after twenty years had grown up to manhood, they set out in search of their father. After many adventures they finally discovered him in the Saracen city. When Gillion heard that his wife was still living he at once demanded permission to return to his home, and Gracienne decided to accompany him. They journeyed by way of Rome, where she

[1] Wolff, *Histoire de Gilion de Trasignyes et de dame Marie sa femme*, Leipzig, 1839; Bayot, *op. cit.*

was a second time baptized by the pope, though no confession was made of her marriage to Gillion and no dispensation was given by the pope to continue the bigamous relation. On their arrival at Trazegnies the first wife received the party joyfully, and when informed of the love of Gracienne and her share in the salvation of Gillion she at once announced her readiness to cede her place to the newcomer. But Gracienne was equally noble and refused to listen to such a sacrifice. Both women entered the same monastery where they lived together until their death, and Gillion withdrew to the abbey of Cambray. Before his death a call for help came to him from the sultan of Babylon to which he responded and in that expedition he died. According to his will, however, his heart was sent back to France and buried in the same tomb between the bodies of his two wives.

It is evident that barring the dénouement and minor details the two stories are identical. The problem is to discover their relation and if possible the source of this tradition. A prominent phase of the investigation is concerned with the question which of the two stories shows the older form of the dénouement. In the German story the husband lives with both wives; in the French version both withdraw to the same nunnery to finish their days.

It was Gaston Paris who first called attention to this legend of the husband with two wives in a paper read in 1887 before the Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-lettres, which he later reproduced in his volume *La Poésie du Moyen-âge, deuxième série*, Paris, 1895.[1] He emphasized there the similarity which it shows with Marie de France's lay of *Eliduc*, "le chef-d'œuvre de Marie de France et l'une des œuvres les plus poétiques que nous ait laissées le moyen-âge." Quite recently the French prose *Roman de Gillion de Trazegnies* was made the subject of a detailed examination by Alphonse Bayot of the University of Louvain in the monograph already cited, and this scholar came to the conclusion that the German story is younger than and derives from the French, and that the French story has its direct source in Marie's lay. Gaston Paris limited his comparison to the three stories mentioned

[1] Pp. 109-30, 2d ed., Paris, 1905.

so far, and added to them the legend of *Griselidis*. Yet this last-mentioned story does not properly belong in the cycle of the legend of the husband with two wives except inasmuch as Griselidis accepts her disgrace and the substitution of another wife in her place. In all other respects the plot is entirely different. The second marriage is here the last of a series of trials all intended to show the heroine's humility, and this element does not properly enter into the stories which relate various forms of the legend under consideration. However, the cycle as such is larger. Besides the *Roman d'Ille et Galeron* mentioned in a note by Gaston Paris, it includes the story of *Horn et Rimenhild* as well as episodes from *Bueve de Haumtone* and the *Tristan* legend, and if our point of view is correct Marie de France's *Lai du Fraisne* and the *Roman de Galeran* in some particulars are also closely related to it.

Gautier d'Arras' *Roman d'Ille et Galeron* has so far been looked upon merely as a variant of the lay of *Eliduc*, inasmuch as it was believed to represent a conscious reversal of its main motive undertaken by the author in order to correct the immorality of the Celtic story. However, in an article published in *Modern Philology*, IV, pp. 471–88, I have tried to show that this point of view is inaccurate, and that this *roman d'aventure* rests indeed as the author claims upon a lost lay with the same title, which bore striking resemblance to the song of *Horn et Rimenhild*. It is the interrelation of these different stories and the formation of the legend of the husband with two wives which we shall try to elucidate in the following pages.

II

The most convenient starting-point for our discussion will be a portion of the outline of the *Ille et Galeron* story reduced to its lowest terms, as we posited it in the article referred to on p. 482. A youth unknown and deprived of his heritage arrives at a court, where he distinguishes himself by his bravery and is raised to an important office. In consequence a princess falls in love with him, and the two are married. Presently, they are separated. The knight journeys to another court, where similar scenes are re-enacted, but he remains steadfast to his first love.

It is evident that we have here a type of story made up by the repetition of the same simple theme. All the essential features of the first half are duplicated in the second. Now we have at least one Old French poem in which this theme appears in its simple form, and that is the *Mainet*[1] in which the *enfances* of Charlemagne are related. An outline of this poem is as follows:

Charles, persecuted by Heudri and Rainfroi his treacherous half-brothers, makes his escape before the age of fifteen, together with nine companions, among whom is his faithful servant David, and arrives at Toledo at the court of King Galafre. Here he takes on the name of *Mainet*, at once distinguishes himself by his bravery and kills Caïmant, the commander of the army which is just then attacking Galafre. At the court he attracts the attention of all by his courtesy and Galienne, Galafre's daughter, falls in love with him. Then the Saracen king convokes his barons, makes public recognition of the valor of Mainet, and announces his intention of dubbing him a knight and bestowing upon him a portion of his land and the hand of his daughter, though she is sought in marriage by thirty kings, among whom Braimant is the most prominent. Mainet accepts all these offers and promises to present to Galafre the head of Braimant. A battle soon follows in which he meets this condition, and Galafre then prepares to fulfil his promise. Now traitors malign Mainet, telling Galafre that he had sworn to overthrow him and seize his realm as soon as he had become the husband of Galienne. A further plot to do bodily harm to Mainet is foiled through the aid of Galienne and all manage to escape. After a successful expedition to Rome Mainet returns and marries Galienne.

We shall now attempt to show that several of the poems of our group show all the essential features of this version of the exile-and-return formula, but in reduplication. And we may add that it is in this doubling that according to our belief the starting-point of our legend must be seen. The simplest form of this new type of story is apparently represented by the song of *Horn et Rimenhild.*[2]

[1] Cf. Gaston Paris, *Romania*, IV, pp. 305-37.

[2] The story of Horn and Rimenhild has come down to us in two versions, the Anglo-Norman poem published by Brede and Stengel in *Ausgaben und Abhandlungen*, Marburg, 1885, and the Early English *King Horn* edited by McKnight for the Early English Text Society in 1901,

Driven from home by national enemies Horn arrives at the age of ten (of fifteen in the English version) with a crowd of companions given as fifteen in the French, twelve in the English version, in the land of Hunlaf, king of Suddene. As his beauty and courtesy become known, Rigmel, the king's daughter, falls in love with him. In a war which follows Horn has the opportunity to show his valor. He is knighted, in this instance before the war actually begins, though, as in the *Mainet*, here also the war is the immediate cause for the ceremony, and he becomes *conestable* of the realm. Before the consent of the king to Horn's marriage with Rigmel, which is implied in the general tone of the story, in view of the signal favors which the king shows to the young knight, though it is not actually expressed, is given, Horn is maligned before the king, the accusation being that he had betrayed the girl and was planning to usurp the king's place. In consequence he is driven into exile. He now goes to the court of Gudreche, king of Westir, where he lives under the assumed name of Gudmod. His story in these new surroundings is essentially the same as that in Hunlaf's court. Lenburc, Gudreche's daughter, falls in love with him. Like Rigmel she makes advances which Gudmod repels. Presently Gudreche is attacked by enemies, and Gudmod can give evidence of his prowess and gain a victory. In consequence Gudreche decides to give Lenburc to Gudmod as his wife and to make him his heir. Gudmod, however, remains faithful to his first love. Soon afterward he receives news that Hunlaf is on the point of marrying Rigmel to another suitor, and giving up his fictitious name he returns to Suddene and frustrates the plans for the wedding which is already in progress.

The duplication of which we have spoken is evident in this outline,[1] and the points of contact with the story of *Mainet* are also striking. To be sure the story of Horn is not an exact duplicate in each of its two halves of the simpler Mainet story. While

both deriving from the same lost Anglo-Norman source. For the latest discussion of this story and the problems connected with it, cf. Schofield, "The Story of Horn and Rimenhild," in *Publications of the Modern Language Association*, XVIII, pp. 1–83.

[1] It goes without saying that I do not wish to declare that the song of *Horn* is the result of a doubling of the *Mainet*. The relative age of the two poems does not affect the explanation offered here. What they have in common is the literary formula upon which they are based, and this appears in simple form in the one and is reduplicated in the other.

it is clear that the main motive is used twice, details may be found in the first or second half, without, however, affecting the validity of our contention. We may point out, therefore, that in both poems the temporary separation of the knight from his lady is caused by the malice of enemies, that Horn lives at Gudreche's court under the assumed name of Gudmod, as Charles under that of Mainet at the court of Galafre, and that the plan of Gudreche to marry Gudmod to his daughter and make him his heir is quite the counterpart even in detail of the similar project of Galafre to unite Mainet and Galienne.

There is an additional point of resemblance between the two stories which should be emphasized. In *Mainet* the young knight distinguishes himself in two encounters, first against enemies that beset Galafre at the time of his arrival, and later against a rejected suitor for the hand of Galienne. In the song of *Horn* there is only one war at either court in which Horn wins victory for his protector, and in both instances the attack is dictated by the desire for conquest. However, this variation is not of vital importance, for we shall see rejected suitors in evidence under similar conditions in other texts of our group, and I have little doubt that this was the cause assigned for the war in the older forms of the *Horn and Rimenhild* story. There is, moreover, a most striking agreement in the English version of the song of *Horn* with the story of Mainet at this very point. Galafre proposed the marriage with Galienne to Mainet on condition that he would bring him the head of Braimant, the rejected suitor. The English poem relates that Horn, having gained the love of Rimenhild, mounts his black steed and sets out for adventure. Riding along the seashore he finds pagan enemies who had come for the conquest of the land. At once he draws his sword and begins a battle in which he kills a hundred of the enemies and gains a decisive victory. Then he hews off the leader's head, fixes it on his sword and returns to the king's hall where he relates his adventure.[1] The agreement and its setting are too close to be due to accident.

We may now turn our attention to the *Roman d'Ille et*

[1] Cf. *King Horn*, ll. 659–82.

Galeron.[1] In my previous article already referred to I called attention to the fact that this poem in its central section, which shows the story of the source, called the *lai d'Ille et Galeron* by Gautier d'Arras, relates a story representing striking similarities to the song of *Horn.* As a matter of fact the relation between the two is much closer than I intimated there. Their relation is so vital that *mutatis mutandis* the one may be looked upon as a replica of the other. The proof of this statement lies in the following detailed comparison of the two poems:

Horn	*Ille et Galeron*
1. Horn, at the age of ten and after his father's death, is driven from home and arrives at the court of Hunlaf in Suddene, where he lives until he is knighted.	1. Ille, at the age of ten and after his father's death, flees to the court of the king of France, where he lives until he is knighted.
2. Horn arrives at Hunlaf's court with fifteen companions according to the French version. The English version gives this number as twelve. In the French version Horn has one particular friend, Haderof by name. In the English poem he has two companions, Hathulf (= Haderof) and Fikenhild. Since Wikele, the latter's counterpart in the French version, is not mentioned until l. 1839 and then without previous introduction, it is more than likely that the English version has here, as in other instances, preserved the better reading, and that in the source of the French poem also Horn had two companions, Haderof and Wikele.	2. The number of Ille's companions is not specified, but later, when he has been knighted and sets out to regain his heritage, he starts out with twelve companions (l. 329) of whom two have been mentioned before (l. 194) as his particular friends with whom he had frequented many tournaments.

[1] Ed. by Förster, Halle, 1891.

Horn	*Ille et Galeron*
3. Rigmel, Hunlaf's daughter, falls in love with Horn and makes advances.	3. At the court of Conain, where Ille arrives after leaving the court of the king of France, Galeron, the count's sister, falls in love with him. He reciprocates the feeling, but neither dares to confess this passion.
4. Horn objects that he is a poor orphan and that Rigmel should select a rich king for her husband.	4. Ille does not dare to confess his love to Galeron because of her high station (l. 1220).
5. Horn wins a victory for Hunlaf and on the demand of his men becomes *conestable* of the realm. The king is apparently ignorant of the relation of Horn and his daughter. Yet he places the most absolute trust in him and loves him as his own child.	5. Ille proves himself so invaluable to Conain that he decides to retain him permanently at his court. He makes him *senescal* of Bretagne and gives him his sister as wife.
6. In the argument which takes place between Horn and Rigmel, when the latter offers him her love, she encourages him to plan for the conquest of his inheritance and assures him that he will be successful.	6. Ille makes the final conquest of his inheritance after the time when Galeron's love for him has become apparent and before Conain decides on the marriage of the two.
7. Hunlaf is old and feeble (l. 1752).	7. Conain is called *le foible duc* (l. 157).
8. Horn leaves Rigmel and goes to the court of Gudreche in Westir, where he lives unrecognized.	8. Ille leaves Galeron and goes to the court of the emperor of Rome, where his identity is unknown.
9. He hides his identity and takes on the name of Gudmod.	9. Ille does not assume a pseudonym, but he hides his identity, claims he is no knight but a simple squire and of humble station (cf. ll. 2029–32, 2043–47, 2054).
10. Gudreche is old and feeble (l. 3573).	10. The emperor of Rome is old (l. 2004) and feeble (l. 2007).

Horn	*Ille et Galeron*
11. Gudreche's realm is attacked by enemies.	11. The emperor of Greece comes with an army to attack Rome.
12. Horn leads Gudreche's army, divided into seven sections, in the battle which follows.	12. Ille is acclaimed *senescal* by the knights on the battlefield (cf. Horn's similar position, No. 5 above), and as commander he divides the Roman army into ten sections.
13. After the victory Gudreche decides to give Horn his daughter Lenburc as wife and to make him his heir.	13. As a result of this victory Ille is confirmed *senescal* by the emperor, and in order to reward him and at the same time to make the bond of union between them stronger, the emperor decides to give him his daughter as wife and to make him his heir.
14. Gudreche seeks the advice of his brother-in-law, the king of Orkenie, and the latter proposes the king's plan to Horn.	14. The emperor intrusts the pope with the task of making the proposition to Ille.
15. Horn rejects the proposal and when chided for his folly speaks of his former love in Suddene to whom he had promised to return.	15. Ille rejects the proposal and the pope chides him for his folly. Thereupon he confesses that he has a wife living in Bretagne.
16. Before giving a decisive answer Horn wishes to find out whether Rigmel has kept her faith. Then he receives news which leads him to disclose his identity, and he sets out for Suddene to break up the forced marriage of Rigmel.	16. Messengers are sent to Bretagne to gather information concerning the whereabouts of Galeron. She appears in Rome in time to hinder the marriage of Ille and Ganor.
17. When Lenburc learns that her marriage with Horn is impossible, she announces her desire to enter a monastery.	17. Galeron enters a monastery at the end, and thus Ille becomes free to marry Ganor.
18. When Horn leaves Rigmel he promises to return if he should hear of Hunlaf's distress.	18. When Ille leaves Ganor in company with his wife he promises to return if she or her country should need his aid.

The parallelisms pointed out in the preceding pages are so convincing, particularly those noted under Nos. 2, 12, 13, 14, and 15, that any attempt to strengthen the evident conclusion by additional argument is unnecessary. We may, therefore, turn our attention at once to the lay of *Eliduc*.[1] The skeleton of this story will be found to resemble the *Mainet* motive and its counterpart, the song of *Horn*.

With ten companions Eliduc arrives as a stranger at the court of the king of Exeter, whom he finds sorely pressed by a rejected suitor for the hand of his daughter. Through his strength and efficiency the adversary is overcome, and in consequence Eliduc becomes the king's chief officer (*guardein de la tere*, l. 270), and the princess falls in love with him.

While the relation to the *Mainet* motive so far is evident there is nevertheless an important variation to be noted. Eliduc is not a child deprived of his heritage and exiled from his native land. He is already married and leaves behind a wife to whom he has promised faith and a speedy return. Yet when we look more closely at the beginning of this lay we shall notice that Eliduc at his home occupies evidently the same position of *guardein de la tere*, which he wins for himself with the king of Exeter (cf. l. 34), that he is forced to leave his home through the machinations of malicious and envious enemies (ll. 40 ff.), and that he had evidently earned this position through his valor, for the lay says that the king *pur sa pruësce le retint* (l. 35). In other words, when looked at from this point of view, the lay begins at a point corresponding exactly to the middle of the similar outline of the song of *Horn*. It looks, therefore, as if the Eliduc story had originally been built up like the song of *Horn*, and that in the form in which we have it the larger portion of the first link in the duplication had been dropped. This lost section could, however, easily be supplied on the basis of the other stories of our group. Let us suppose that Eliduc in his youth was driven from home by enemies or traitors and took refuge at the court of his Breton king. Soon after his arrival this king was attacked by enemies, presumably rejected suitors for the hand of his daughter, and Eliduc

[1] Warnke, *Die Lais der Marie de France*, 2d ed., Halle, 1900, pp. 186–224.

was instrumental in winning a decisive victory for him. The princess thereupon fell in love with the youth, and the king equally appreciative of his valor, dubbed him a knight, bestowed the hand of his daughter upon him and made him guardian of his realm and his heir. Now enemies maligned him and he must leave the land. We note that the lay does not specify the nature of the accusation, but on the basis of the *Mainet* story we might suppose that they accused him of plotting to usurp the reign. If an introduction of this nature were added to the *Eliduc* lay we should have a story which is in all essentials the counterpart of the song of *Horn*, barring of course the difference that Eliduc is married while Horn is not, which affects the incidents of the story, but not the skeleton in which these are made to fit. Eliduc does not live under an assumed name at the court of the king of Exeter, but his antecedents are unknown, and just as Gudmod at the court of Gudreche so Eliduc here creates his position and wins the love of Guilliadun entirely through his personal valor. Now all this, to be sure, is supposition for which the direct proof is probably beyond reach. The wife of Eliduc does not appear to be the daughter of his king, though she is said to be *noble* (l. 9), and there is no hint whatever of any previous history of Eliduc in the lay which Marie wrote. Yet on the other hand, Marie tells us that her lay had formerly borne a different title. While now it is known by the name of *Guildeluëc ha Guilliadun* it was formerly called *Eliduc* (ll. 21–26). We have thus most conclusive evidence of the existence of this lay under a different title. That this different title also implies a different form of the story cannot be affirmed with equal certainty, but it seems to me the facts which I have presented in the preceding pages create at least a strong presumption that such was the case. It does not follow that Marie abridged the story herself. Yet it is certain that the two incidents of the shipwreck and the resuscitation in her lay are not referred to in the short synopsis (ll. 5–28) which she prefixed to the story proper. I called attention to this fact in my previous article (p. 474), and added that it would help the theory if it could be assumed that her omission of any reference to these two episodes was proof that they represented her additions, but that there was not suffi-

cient evidence to warrant such an inference. Granting that she related the story as she heard it, we may ask, however, why she should have made mention of the earlier form of the story, if her own version of it did not vary from the other. And to this question, it seems to me, the present explanation offers an entirely plausible answer. The earlier *Eliduc* story was similar to the song of *Horn* and contained both links of the duplication. The lay of Marie represents an abridgment made either by herself or by a Celtic *conteur* and in this process of alteration it attracted the two episodes mentioned above for which no counterpart or explanation can be found in the group of poems to which the *Eliduc* lay clearly belongs.

In this list of poems showing a knight in contact with several women, there should finally be mentioned the *Roman de Galeran*,[1] though this story is not built up at all along the lines which we have been discussing. Already betrothed to Fraisne Galeran appears at the court of the duke of Metz, and Esmerée the latter's daughter promptly falls in love with him and makes the usual advances, which are rejected by the young knight, who remains true to the memory of his first love. There follows a battle against a rejected suitor for the hand of Esmerée in which Galeran is victorious. Soon after, leaving the court of Metz, he comes to the castle of Brundoré where he meets Florie, the sister of Fraisne. This portion of the poem is based upon a different theme, whose relation to the former we shall discuss in our next chapter.

III

By the side of the motive discussed in the preceding pages and probably causing the duplication which we have observed, another motive was current which was in no wise related to the former, but which was presently closely interwoven with it.

The general form of this theme may be stated as follows: Due to the deceptive similarity of two persons of the same sex, confusion is brought into their relation with a member of the other sex.

As an example of this motive we may may cite first an incident

[1] Published by Boucherie, Montpellier, 1888.

in the story of *Amis and Amiles.*[1] These two friends, born at the same moment, bear such a striking resemblance to each other that even their closest friends cannot distinguish them. Ami is married to a relative of the traitor Hardré. Amile, in love with the daughter of Charlemagne, is accused by Hardré of having betrayed the princess. He protests his innocence, but since he is not as blameless as he pretends to be, Ami takes his place in the duel in which he is supposed to defend his innocence. Ami, of course, comes out the victor, and in consequence he is married to the princess, while his own wife in the meantime falls in love with Amile, whom she takes to be her husband. We have thus in this story, when looked at from this point of view, an example of the husband with two wives, in which the irregular relation is partly due to physical resemblance.

It is this same motive which we can observe distinctly in the poems under consideration. In the original form of it the resemblance was probably conceived as being due to birth at the same time from the same mother. If this conception of its origin is correct, we can see it preserved in its purest form in the *Roman de Galeran*, which we have just cited as being in part based upon the exile motive of *Mainet* and *Horn.*

Here twins are born to the wife of Brundoré and separated immediately because the mother fears the accusation of adultery.[2] One of the twins is called Fraisne after the ash tree, in which she is found after her exposure by a trusty servant. The other, who remains with the mother, is called Florie. Fraisne is reared in the cloister before whose doors she was discovered, and becomes the sweetheart of Galeran, the nephew of the abbess, with whom she grows up. When later Galeran is separated from Fraisne, the story puts him in contact first with Esmerée, daughter of the duke of Metz. Here prominent features of the exile formula are made use of. Esmerée makes advances and Galeran defeats a rejected suitor. Later he meets Florie, the twin sister of Fraisne, and here the knight, who showed himself disdainful and ready to repel the

[1] Published by Hofmann, Erlangen, 1852.

[2] For a discussion of this widespread theme cf. Köhler in Warnke, *Die Lais der Marie de France*, 2d ed., pp. lxxxvii ff.

advances of Esmerée, at once succumbs to the memories which the resemblance of Florie to Fraisne awakens in him. Even at the first interview he forgets all proprieties and tries to take Florie in his arms and kiss her, all for the memory of Fraisne.[1] And later, when the marriage between him and Florie is decided upon, he accepts it solely for the memory of Fraisne whom he constantly sees in Florie.[2]

It is important to note that the resemblance in this story is, on the one hand, described directly and, on the other, also indicated by the names of the two girls; for there can be little question that the two words *Fraisne* and *Florie* are intended for that purpose.

Resemblance both in name and fact is, however, distinctly the center of this theme in the form in which it appears in the following episode in the Tristan story. Tristan is forced to leave the court of Marc, and after a long journey through different lands he arrives in Bretagne where he makes the acquaintance of Kaherdin and his sister Isolt aux Blanches Mains. At this point Bédier[3] accepts Gottfried of Strassburg as showing the original form of the story and he gives the following wording as representing the substance of this passage in the Thomas version: "Elle rappelait sans cesse à Tristan l'autre Isolt, Isolt d'Irlande, et parcequ'elle s'appelait Isolt, ce nom le faisait si troublé et si joyeux, quand ces regards tombaient sur elle, que l'on pouvait voir dans ses yeux l'émoi de son cœur." The parallel which this episode presents with the story whose growth we are studying is important. It differs from it in detail, but not in spirit. Tristan, when he marries Isolt aux Blanches Mains breaks his faith with the other Isolt as much as does Eliduc, when he is ready to carry Guilliadun away from her father's castle.[4]

That this theme is at work in the poems of our group appears clearly from the song of *Horn*. In the French form of that story all trace of it has disappeared and the two princesses with whom Horn comes in contact are called Rigmel and Lenburc, but these

[1] Cf. ll. 5221 ff. [2] Cf. ll. 6440 ff.

[3] *Le Roman de Tristan par Thomas*, publié par J. Bédier, Paris, 1902, p. 258.

[4] Some very interesting and striking additional points of resemblance between the Tristan legend and the song of *Horn* were recently pointed out by Miss Weston in *Romania* XXXV, pp. 524, 525, 526.

are not the names of the original story. In the English version the name of the first appears in a variety of forms which all seem to be based on an original Rimenhild, a name which is derived from the AS Irmenhild or Eormenhild. The second is called Reynild with slight variations in two of the manuscripts in which this version has come down to us, but in the third manuscript this girl is called Ermenhild. When we consider the fact that this is the very manuscript in which other names of the original form of the story have been preserved, such as Aaluf, Gudmod, and Fykel, which agree with the French version but are changed to Murry, Cutberd, and Fikenhild in the other English manuscripts, the evidence is very strong that *Ermenhild* also belongs to the original form of the story. The bearing of this fact was clearly seen by Schofield in his study on the *Story of Horn and Rimenhild*,[1] who compared the two Rimenhilds of this story to the two Isolts of the Tristan legend. It follows that the song of *Horn* in its early form must have contained the same resemblance theme which we have observed in the *Roman de Galeran*.

With these facts in mind we can understand why in the *Lai du Fraisne*, which is the direct source of the *Roman de Galeran*, the two girls with whom Gurun is associated are called Le Fraisne and La Coldre, the ash and the hazel, and we have also found the meaning of the evident alliteration in the names of Galeran and Ganor in *Ille et Galeron* and of Guildeluëc and Guilliadun in the *Eliduc* lay. All reference to the physical resemblance has disappeared, while the method of expressing it has remained.

IV

We have now reached a point from which we are enabled to view the lay of *Eliduc* and the other texts which we are studying at a new angle. In all of them we find a knight brought in contact with two maidens. When grouped with reference to the attitude of the hero and the dénouement these stories submit to the following fourfold division.

1. The knight is not married to the first maiden but succumbs to the resemblance to her which the appearance of the second

[1] *Publications of the Modern Language Association*, Vol. XVIII, p 35.

maiden suggests. The texts belonging here are the *Lai du Fraisne*, *Galeran*, and *Tristan*. It will be noticed that the exile formula as such is absent here and that the stories are based solely on the resemblance theme.

2. The knight is not married to the first maiden and remains true to her, illustrated by the song of *Horn*.[1]

3. The knight is married to the first maiden and succumbs to the charms of the second, illustrated by *Eliduc*.

4. The knight is married to the first maiden and remains true to his vows. Here belong *Ille et Galeron*, the lost lay from which it derives, and the episodes from *Bueve de Haumtone* discussed in my previous article (*loc. cit.*, pp. 484 ff.).

Without recognizing the relation between these types Förster tried to prove that type 4 represents a reversal, made on moral grounds, of type 3. The evidence of my previous article and the arguments brought forward in the present discussion have shown that this point of view is no longer tenable. *Ille et Galeron* appears to be a reversal of *Eliduc* only if the final marriage of Ille with Ganor, which is entirely foreign to the story proper, is accepted as being its logical end. The present grouping shows that *Ille et Galeron* has the solution of both types 3 and 4. Hence one of the two, and evidently the second, must be a later addition. The accuracy of this contention will appear more clearly if it can be shown that *Bueve de Haumtone*, the other poem in this group, shows a skeleton similar to that which *Ille et Galeron* had in its simpler form.

There can be no question that the central plot of the Beves story is based on the exile formula. A brief outline will reveal all the characteristic features with which we have become familiar in the earlier portions of this paper. Driven from home, Beves arrives, after various adventures, at the court of King Hermin, whose daughter Josiane promptly falls in love with him and makes the usual advances. Presently Beves is maligned and accused of having betrayed Josiane. The king sends him into a foreign land bearing a message which is to throw him into prison for life.

[1] A variation of this theme appears to occur in the unpublished poem on *Gui de Warwick*; cf. *Modern Philology*, IV, p. 483, footnote 6.

After seven years of captivity he manages to escape and to steal Josiane from the husband whom she had been forced to wed in the meantime. Together they arrive at Haumtone and Beves conquers his heritage. Presently he must leave his home again in disgrace and go into exile. He takes his wife along, but before they have reached a definite resting-place, he is separated from her and now each seeks the other for a space of seven years. During this period Beves arrives in the city of Civile, which according to the Norse version of the story, is beset by rejected suitors for the hand of the lady of the land. Beves wins a victory, the princess falls in love with him, and he repels her advances because of his existing marriage. Finally he is forced to accept a new marriage in form which is to be consummated in reality at the end of seven years, if the first wife should still remain undiscovered at the end of that period. Before the time has elapsed, Josiane arrives in Civile and the princess is forced to accept another husband.

To be sure this outline gives no idea of the real substance of the Beves poem. Yet it is equally certain that it represents the kernel of the story, when reduced to its lowest terms. To extract it not a single feature needs to be exaggerated, no detail is transposed out of its natural order.

V

We may now consider the question whether the present dénouement of the *Eliduc* lay is natural to the story or whether it originally ended in a picture of bigamy as in the legend of the count of Gleichen, and whether this solution of the story was Christianized by Marie de France or her predecessor. The answer to this question is, however, bound up to a certain extent with the explanation of that portion of Marie's lay which leads up to the dénouement, and therefore it will be necessary as a basis for our further discussion to add in the first place an outline of the *Eliduc* story from the point where we have left it.

Called back to his home, Eliduc leaves his new love Guilliadun with the promise to return to her in the near future, and this he does as soon as circumstances permit. He meets her at night before the walls of the city, and carries her off to a ship which is

waiting for them. During the journey a storm arises, and the sailors accuse Eliduc, whose real wife they know, as being the cause of their danger. When Guilliadun hears the news she falls into a swoon so like death that Eliduc believes she has passed away. Full of anger he kills the skipper, takes hold of the helm and safely guides the boat to the shore. Enjoining secrecy upon his companions, he plans to take the body of Guilliadun to a chapel in the neighborhood of his home for burial. When he arrives there he finds that the hermit who cared for it had died shortly before, and he orders the body placed before the altar in the little church, until proper plans for the erection of an abbey or a monastery in Guilliadun's honor shall have been made.

Then he goes to his home, where his wife receives him with joy which he cannot reciprocate, for his sorrow is ever present. Every day he goes to the chapel to see the body of Guilliadun which remains lifelike and rosy. Finally the wife learns from a faithful servant the object of Eliduc's daily walk and visits the chapel herself. The sight which meets her eye tells her the secret of her husband. While she gives way to her sorrow, a weasel comes from under the altar and runs across the body of Guilliadun and the squire who had accompanied Guildeluëc kills it with a stick. Soon the mate of the weasel appears and seeing what had been done it runs into the woods and brings a red flower which it puts into the mouth of the dead animal with the result that it comes back to life. Both wife and squire now capture the red flower and as soon as they have placed it into the mouth of Guilliadun, she awakens from her long swoon. There follows a dialogue in which Guildeluëc hears of the breach of faith of her husband. With great magnanimity she announces her intention to enter a nunnery and thus give way to her rival. She takes Guilliadun back to the castle with her, and makes known her decision to Eliduc who gladly accepts the sacrifice and supplies her with the means to erect a nunnery in the neighborhood. Then he marries Guilliadun and the two live many years together, until they see the wrong which they have done, and Guilliadun withdraws to the same nunnery as Guildeluëc, while Eliduc builds a monastery to which he retires to finish his days in penitence.

The source of this portion of our lay was investigated by Nutt in an article entitled "The Lai of Eliduc and the Märchen of Little Snowwhite," in *Folklore*, Vol. III (1892), pp. 26 ff. He came to the conclusion that Marie's lay had the same antecedents as the Scotch *Märchen* of Goldtree and Silvertree. To make the discussion clear we must repeat here an outline of this story.

Silvertree, the wife, is jealous of Goldtree, the daughter. She consults a trout in a well as to who is fairest and learns it is her daughter, whereat she takes to her bed and declares one thing alone will heal her, her daughter's heart and liver. A he-goat's heart and liver are given her, and Goldtree is sent off secretly and married to a foreign king. After a year Silvertree consults the trout again and learns that her daughter is still alive. She sets sail for the foreign land and kills Goldtree by placing a poisoned dart in her finger; but so beautiful did Goldtree look that her husband did not bury her, but locked her in a room where no one could get near her. After a while he married again and the whole house was under the hand of this wife but one room, of which he himself kept the key. One day he forgot the key and the second wife got into the room. What did she find there but the most beautiful woman she ever saw. Taking the poisoned dart out of her finger Goldtree rose alive, as beautiful as she ever was. At the fall of night the prince came home downcast. "What wager," said his wife, "would you make with me that I could not make you laugh?" "Nothing could make me laugh save Goldtree to come alive." "Well, you have her alive down there in the room." When the prince saw Goldtree, he began to kiss her and kiss her and kiss her, until the second wife saw that he loved Goldtree best and said she would go away. "No," said the prince, "indeed you will not go away, but I shall have both of you." It is then told how the wicked Silvertree is punished, thanks to the second wife, and the story winds up with "the prince and his two wives were long alive after this, pleased and peaceful, and there I left them."

Criticism has been rather silent with regard to this claim. Only Warnke in his second edition of the *Lais* of Marie de France (pp. 149–150) calls attention to the fact that the story cited by Nutt is a combination of the following themes: (1) The Märchen

of *Schneewittchen*, which may also be found elsewhere joined to the story of two women loving the same man; (2) the motive of the locked room, best known from the story of Bluebeard; (3) the Eliduc story with an ending similar to that of the lay. The first wife wakens the second from her trance. She announces the fact to her husband and decides to cede her place to the second wife.

Nutt's *Märchen*, he goes on to say, shows the husband living with both wives. This he thinks is a more logical ending to a bigamy story than that of *Eliduc*, but on the other hand Marie's version stands evidently closer to the original in the way in which it relates that Eliduc came to have two wives. However, this element of the story had to disappear when the *Eliduc* theme was joined to the *Schneewittchen* motive and hence the plot of Nutt's *Märchen*.

Let us point out in the first place a vital difference between the two stories, not noted by Warnke. In the *Märchen* the husband does not commit bigamy, since his wife is apparently dead. When through the curiosity of the second wife the first comes to life again he finds himself suddenly joined to two women. But no wrong has been committed; in fact through the resuscitation of the first wife a previous crime has been righted, and since heaven has thus directly caused the confusion, it would seem to follow that no disapproval could fall upon the hero if he accepts the irregular relation, though his doubts as to the morality of it are voiced by the intention of the second wife to cede her place. In other words the solution of the *Märchen* is perfectly logical in a story which is made up through a combination of the *Schneewittchen* with the *Bluebeard* theme.

I doubt whether the *Eliduc* story has anything to do with this *Märchen*. The attitude of the husband is different, the rôles of the women are inverted, and the keynote of its plot is jealousy of the stepmother (the *Schneewittchen* theme). The only real similarity is the trance and resuscitation of Guilliadun, and in addition the bigamous relation of Eliduc, if indeed Marie's story shows an altered and younger dénouement, a question to which the answer should not be given without further consideration. Let us attempt

to find this answer on the basis of the data which we have established.

We have shown the presence of the exile formula in the lay and have also established a strong presumption in favor of the fact that the original story contained a duplication of this theme. We have further shown that the resemblance theme was joined to this reduplication. It follows that Eliduc must commit at the second court actions in conflict with the troth plighted during the first exile. In other words, like Gurun, Galeran, and Tristan he must be ready to neglect his first love. The main difference in his case lies in the fact that he is actually married, and this feature shows that we are dealing with a younger form of the story.

Granting that he persists in his attitude of being willing to forget his duty to his wife, we may consider the possibilities of the situation brought about by this new combination. When he leaves the court of Exeter we may ask what he can do with Guilliadun and what will be the attitude of his wife. With reference to the first question it is evident that he can either (1) bring the second woman to his home, or (2) establish the newcomer near his home and try to live in secret in this double relation. The first wife will either (1) accept the double relation, or (2) cede her place to her rival.

With reference to the first question scrutiny of the poem indicates that the second part of the alternative stated above fits properly into the story. Eliduc knows that he is doing wrong, for he thinks of his wife (ll. 322–26), he conceals her existence at the court of Exeter, and finally decides to keep his faith to her in fact, but to approach the point of breaking it as closely as he can (ll. 463–77). When he is called home by his first lord the only logical method for him to pursue is to continue his previous concealment. All the probabilities, therefore, are in favor of the belief that the source of Marie's poem related that Eliduc brought Guilliadun to the neighborhood of his home.

The answer to the second query presents a little more difficulty for either solution of the dilemma would form a satisfactory end to the story. In general, however, scholars have declared themselves more or less clearly in favor of the view that the original climax

of the story was bigamous, and that Marie de France has altered it, or that it had already been altered in her immediate source under the influence of Christianity. The question became in addition complicated with the further problem of the geographical source of this tradition. Nutt endeavored to show that the bigamy of Eliduc represents a remnant of the practice of bigamy among the ancient Celts, Gaston Paris inclined to western origin "dans un milieu où la monogamie était un devoir strict de l'homme et un droit sacré de la femme,"[1] while Bayot, finally, cites the Indian drama *Vikramorvaçi* of the sixth century of our era,[2] which appears to present in its central theme some analogies with the legend under consideration.

When we consider the lay of *Eliduc* in relation to the other texts of the group to which it clearly belongs, we shall see, however, that the solution which this poem brings is in perfect harmony with that found in the others. The same readiness on the part of one of the two women involved to cede her place to the newcomer is evident in them all. What the *Tristan* story would have been if the first Isolt had arrived before the death of Tristan we cannot imagine, but the other texts are clear. The *Roman de Galeran*, which has preserved the resemblance theme in its purest form, relates that Florie entered a cloister, and in the same way Lenburc in the Anglo-Norman song of *Horn* at once expresses her wish to withdraw to a nunnery as soon as she discovers her hero's love for Rigmel. There can be no question, however, that even here in both cases the solution is Christianized. Its older form appears in the other poems. In the *Lai du Fraisne*, the source of the *Roman de Galeran*, La Coldre simply cedes her place and eventually finds another husband; similarly in the English *King Horn* the hero at once proposes another marriage for Lenburc; in the *Beves* story the duchess of Civile accepts another husband than the one that she had selected; and also in the *Griselidis* legend the submissive first wife accepts the substitution of a younger rival. Everything, therefore, seems to speak in favor of the conclusion that in this particular, as well as in the others that we have noted earlier, the *Eliduc* lay is in harmony with the poems

[1] *Op. cit.* p. 127. [2] *Op. cit.* p. 102.

to which it belongs and that the present dénouement, though evidently Christianized in that the rejected wife selects a nunnery as her place of refuge, is that which belonged to the original story.

It should be noted, in the next place, that the various poems of our group belong geographically closely together. Marie refers distinctly to a Celtic lay; the home of Ille is in Bretagne; Galeran is born in Nantes, and similarly the scene of the *Lai du Fraisne* lies in Bretagne. All the stories considered here, *Horn et Rimenhild* included, evidently belong to a region in which the Celtic substratum could exert decisive influence. Whether the dénouement that these stories present rests upon an earlier form involving bigamy, we are not prepared to say. This phase of the problem rests upon considerations which we have neither the competence nor the data to discuss. This much, however, is clear, that unless it should be distinctly proved that the Celts originally practiced bigamy, which does not seem to have been done so far,[1] such a condition is not necessary for the explanation of our stories. All appear perfectly clear if accepted as resting upon an older and more primitive habit of society in which a wife could be pushed aside for a new and more favorite rival, which is imperfectly Christianized in Marie's lay, and which appears clearly in the *Lai du Fraisne* and perhaps also in the *Griselidis* legend.

With these facts in mind we can readily understand how the *Eliduc* lay, based in its essence upon the framework which we have uncovered, attracted the elements for which the other members of our group present no parallels. The discovery by Guildeluëc of her husband's double relation by chance or curiosity, probably the latter, suggested the "Bluebeard" story. There, it will be remembered, curiosity leads the wife to discover the dead bodies of her predecessors. If this point of view is accurate, we can understand why Guildeluëc should find Guilliadun in a trance. In the next place an explanation of this apparent death was called for, and this brought in the motive of the trance and resuscitation, a widely scattered theme discussed with abundant detail by Köhler.[2] To explain the trance itself, the story of the

[1] For the attitude of the Celts toward marriage cf. Bedier, *Le Roman de Tristan par Thomas*, Vol. II, p. 163.

[2] See Warnke's edition of Marie's *Lais*, pp. 154 ff.

storm due to Eliduc's guilt and the consequences to which it gave rise may have been added in the next place. The cause of this addition lies probably in the fact that in the simplest form of the story Eliduc brought his new love to his home. Here we have another widely scattered tradition, discussed equally fully by Köhler.[1] The religious and Christian tone of this motive, however, indicates a more recent date for its introduction.

Summing up our conclusions, we may say that the *Eliduc* lay is made up of a reduplication of the exile formula combined with the resemblance theme. The union of these two elements makes it practically certain that the present dénouement of the lay in its essence represents the original solution. At a later stage this story attracts the "Bluebeard" theme and the other widely scattered traditions of the trance and resuscitation, as well as that of the stormy sea-voyage caused by the moral guilt of one of the occupants of the boat.

VI

We are now prepared to discuss the relation of *Roman de Gillion de Trazegnies* and of the legend of the count of Gleichen to the earlier forms of this tradition.

With reference to the former, Gaston Paris believed (*op. cit.*, p. 124), "que le roman hennuyer repose sur une forme de la tradition semblable à celle d'où est sorti le lai breton." Bayot, in the study of this legend already cited (pp. 65 ff.) goes a step farther and sees in the *Eliduc* lay itself the principal source of the rimed version from which the prose in turn derives. The accuracy of this claim he tries to establish by a long list of parallel passages in which he sees resemblances between the lay and the fifteenth-century prose. Moreover, he believes that the indebtedness of the author of the rimed *Gillion de Trazegnies* to Marie de France goes farther, and that traces of the *Lai du Fraisne* and of *Milun* can be discovered by a similar minute analysis. However, this portion of Bayot's study fails to be convincing. The resemblances which he notes are not close enough to prove actual dependence of the younger text upon the older, and in fact are

[1] *Op. cit.*, pp. 151 ff.

just such as we should expect to find if the relation between them were that accepted by Gaston Paris. And until more definite proof to the contrary can be shown we shall continue to believe that both the *Eliduc* lay and the *Roman de Gillion de Trazegnies* derive from the same common source. This last form of the story related the Eliduc tradition as we have unraveled it and without the later additions. Of this version some traits have remained unchanged in the prose novel. Gillion leaves his wife and arrives at a foreign court where he renders valuable service in repelling the attack of a rejected suitor for the hand of a princess who falls in love with him. He accepts her advances, and brings her to his home. Other features of the story have been modernized under the influence of Christianity and the Crusades. Gillion's journey becomes a pilgrimage to the Holy Land, and his stay at the foreign court is conceived of as being due to captivity among the Saracens. He remains faithful to his marriage vow until he has reason to believe that his wife has died, and when this illusion is cleared up by the arrival of his sons, the second wife accompanies him to his home with full knowledge and in the expectation of a hostile reception.

The closest similarity, however, persists in the final dénouement. Both the first wife and the newcomer withdraw to the same nunnery, and the hero enters a monastery. That this life of penitence is here begun at once, while in the *Eliduc* lay several years intervene between the monastic vows of Guildeluëc and those of Guilliadun and Eliduc changes the solution in spirit, but not in fact. Bigamy, in the proper sense of the term, is, therefore, absent from both stories, though it is clear that Eliduc, with his more primitive attitude toward woman, may be looked upon as an example of a husband with two wives. Yet it becomes very evident that this name fits the relation inadequately when the dénouement of the legend of the count of Gleichen is placed by the side of *Eliduc* and *Gillion de Trazegnies*.

Here it is related that by a papal dispensation the hero lived for many years in peace and joy with his two wives. Now Bayot has shown very clearly[1] that this variant of our legend is quite young.

[1] Cf. *op. cit.*, pp. 81 ff.

The first reference to it appears in the year 1539 in the argument which the landgrave Philip of Hesse, whose first wife was still living, addressed to Luther and Melanchthon in order to induce them to authorize his marriage with Margaret von der Saal. In that document we find only a brief allusion to this tradition. The full account appears seven years later in 1546. There can be no question, however, that Bayot's contention is exact and that the later full version derives from the French prose novel of the fifteenth century. In that case the dénouement of the German story was not contained in the source, and we may look for the causes which probably were potent in introducing the alteration.

The question of polygamy was widely discussed during the period of the Reformation and was, indeed, to a certain extent, a living issue at that time. In fact it is evident that considerable uncertainty with reference to it existed both in the Catholic and in the Protestant Church.[1] One of the earliest causes of this discussion was the divorce of Henry VIII of England. The *impedimentum affinitatis* upon which it turned (Catherine of Aragon had been the wife of Arthur, Henry's deceased brother) had opened up the whole question and had led the German reformers to take decided positions in the matter. Those who were disinclined to recognize the illegality of the first marriage, or to countenance a divorce were led to look upon a double marriage as a possible solution of the dilemma. Luther and Melanchthon were of this group.[2] Henry raised the question whether the pope could give a dispensation for a bigamous marriage and Clemens at one time virtually agreed to give such a permission, and certainly Cajetan[3] seems to have believed with Luther and the reformers that such a proceeding would be entirely possible and legal. The whole discussion turned upon the prohibition of divorce and whether polygamy is absolutely forbidden by the teaching of Christ.

These circumstances explain the revival of this story in Germany at that time and also present the key to the variations which our legend contains in this its youngest form. There was a vague and poorly understood tradition in Erfurt connected with a tomb-

[1] Cf. Rockwell, *Die Doppelehe des Landgrafen von Hessen*, Marburg, 1904.

[2] Rockwell, *op. cit.*, pp. 236-78. [3] *Ibid.*, p. 305.

stone on which a man was pictured reclining between two women, presumably his wives, but in succession and not simultaneously. This tradition had become attached to a member of the family of Gleichen. A similar tomb in the Hainaut had caused a simpler form of the *Eliduc* story to be attached to the house of Trazegnies. When Philip of Hesse was agitating for his bigamous marriage, attention was directed to this tombstone and vague tradition. It was used by him as an argument in his favor, and in consequence the French story, which may have been unknown in Germany until that time, became directly attached to this new center and soon showed evidence of the influence of its new surroundings. Philip of Hesse, when he cites it, together with the marriage of Henry VIII, as precedents for his own case, mentions already the two principal variations which the tradition had undergone, viz., the dispensation of the pope and the bigamous union.[1] But this new form did not find a full expression until the year 1546 and then we find the whole legend readjusted so as to appear to sanction the bigamous marriage of Philip, to which both Luther and Melanchthon had in the meantime given their assent.

If this point of view is correct, and everything speaks in its favor, the German legend cannot be adduced in an argument tending to show the dénouement of the original form of the *Eliduc* lay, as indeed has been done, the question of the existence or absence among the early Celts of the practice of bigamy has no place in the argument, and in fact the legend of the husband with two wives, if this phrase be taken in its narrowest sense, has no place in Old French literature.

NOTE.—In the footnote on p. 109 of the article cited, Gaston Paris promised a comprehensive study of our legend and cited the story of *Notre Dame de Liesse* as an important member of the cycle which he intended to discuss. This legend relates that three knights of the family of Eppes in Picardy near Laon fell into the hands of the Saracens and became prisoners of the sultan. The latter tried every means in his power to induce them to deny their Christian faith. Finally he sent his daughter Ismerie to them in the hope that her physical charms might lead the Christian knights to forswear their faith. However, the result was con-

[1] "So hat der Pabst selbst einen Grafen von Gleichen, welcher zum heiligen Grab gewesen und in Erfahrung kommen, sein Weib solle todt sein, deswegen er eine andere nahm, zugelassen, dass er sie alle Beide mocht behalten."—Bayot, *op. cit.*, p. 81.

trary to his expectations. Ismerie became interested in the faith of the Christians, and when she heard them speak of the charms of Notre Dame she expressed the wish that she might see a statue of her. The knights then promised to carve one for her, if she would furnish them with wood and knife. But they had promised more than they could fulfil, for they did not know the art of carving, and wearied with their efforts and with a prayer on their lips they fell asleep. During the night a bright light filled their gloomy prison, and Notre Dame in person brought her statue. When Ismerie saw the image on the following day she was converted, and all now planned to escape to France. Again Notre Dame lent her aid. The three knights with Ismerie and the statue were miraculously carried during their sleep to their native land, where Ismerie was baptized, and a church was erected at Liesse near Laon in honor of Notre Dame and her miraculous statue (cf. *Image de Nostre Dame de Liesse, ou son histoire authentique* par un religieux de la Compagnie de Jésus, Reims, 1632; *Nouvelle Histoire de Notre Dame de Liesse*, Laon, 1858; Les abbés E. et A. Duployé, *Notre Dame de Liesse, Légende et pèlerinage*, 2 vols., Reims, 1862).

It is evident that this legend lacks the essential feature of the stories under discussion. Yet knowing the accuracy of Gaston Paris in matters of this kind, it is impossible to believe that we have to do with a lapse of memory or a faulty reference. On looking closely it is also evident that several points of contact with the legend of *Gillion de Trazegnies* are clearly present. The Christian knights are in captivity among the Saracens, they owe their lives to the interest of a Saracen princess, and they finally return to their native land accompanied by the Saracen woman, who has accepted their faith. It is possible, therefore, that Gaston Paris conceived of the *Roman de Gillion de Trazegnies* as being the result of a mixture of the *Eliduc* tradition with the theme evident in the legend of *Notre Dame de Liesse*. His death makes it impossible to know what his intentions were or to say how he looked upon the problem, and the impossibility of submitting the solution offered here to his criticism, the consciousness that the eyes that saw so clearly are closed, and that the fountain of help that flowed so freely has ceased, overpowers me as I write the closing lines of this study amidst the scenes of his activity. The sense of personal loss which we all felt when he was taken from us is with me during this first visit to Paris since his death, and I cannot close this note without paying tribute to the memory of this scholar who became the teacher and the friend of all who had the good fortune to come in contact with him.

JOHN E. MATZKE

LELAND STANFORD JR. UNIVERSITY

NOTES ON GOLDSMITH

"Believe me, my head has no share in all I write; my heart dictates the whole." Thus wrote Goldsmith in an early letter to his brother. In these words he told at least half the truth—the more important half—about his masterpieces. For when all their obvious humor, their noisy fun, their quaintness, have been enjoyed, the best yet remains unappreciated, and in general, must so remain; since it is an excellence too subtle—perhaps too idealistic—to be realized by the many and to awaken general acclaim. A certain emotional quality permeates all his best work, and especially the *Vicar of Wakefield*, touching its gayest passages with a faint suggestion of sadness, like a *scherzo* of Beethoven, yet, with contrary effect, lightening its darkness so that it never becomes the darkness of utter despair. Once perceived, this influence of Goldsmith is actual and strong; but to him who would define it, and communicate it, it becomes evasive and illusory. Certainly no means of discovering and retaining it seems less likely than the straitened and formal process of the dissertation. Nevertheless a number of such studies in Goldsmith have recently appeared, of which even the most mechanical has helped in some degree to a better appreciation of the poet.[1]

The essential quality of Goldsmith's art to which I have referred offers a peculiar temptation to the critic. He is prompted by it to impressionistic and emotional effusion about the work and life of Goldsmith, while he neglects the sober facts, and sane, impartial judgment enters but slightly into his estimate. It is such errors that the dissertation and the *programm*, with their unenthusiastic recital of the dry facts, will help to correct. But however prosy they may be, they are often highly suggestive and prolific of *mar-*

[1] B. Neuendorff, *Entstehungsgeschichte von Goldsmith's Vicar of Wakefield* (Berlin, 1903); H. Schacht, *Der Gute Pfarrer in der englischen Literatur bis zu Goldsmith's Vicar of Wakefield* (Berlin, 1904); W. Fischer, *Goldsmith's Vicar of Wakefield* (*Anglia*, 25, 129–208; 27, 516–554; also published separately); H. Sollas, *Goldsmith's Einfluss in Deutschland im achtzehnten Jahrhundert* (Heidelberg, 1903); R. Hering, *Goldsmith's Vicar of Wakefield* (Dessau, 1905). Hering's study reviews, corrects, and supplements the first three of these, and is more scholarly and intelligent than they.

ginalia, and it is from a number of such jottings in these studies in Goldsmith that I have selected the following notes.

The first of these notes concerns Goldsmith's interest in Methodism, or, more strictly speaking, in Wesleyanism. Dr. Schacht has shown that Dr. Primrose resembles in some respects Mr. Williams and Dr. Bartlett, the ecclesiastics in Richardson's *Pamela* and *Sir Charles Grandison;* he has also commented upon certain Wesleyan traits in these characters. But the influence of Wesley and Methodism upon Goldsmith was more direct than this. In his study of *Methodism and English Literature of the Last Century* (Erlangen and Leipzig, 1895), J. A. Swallow cites four allusions to Methodism in Goldsmith, three of which ridicule the absurdities and extremes of practice among the less intelligent enthusiasts.[1] But that the poet distinguished between these and their more gifted leaders is shown by a paper on popular preachers written for the *Ladies' Magazine* in 1759, and reprinted in 1765 as No. 17 of his *Collected Essays*.[2] I select two sentences: "Reason is but a weak antagonist when headlong passion dictates; in all such cases we should arm one passion against another." And again: "Our regular divines may borrow instruction from even Methodists, who go their circuits, and preach prizes among the populace. Even Whitefield may be placed as a model to some of our young divines; let them join to their own good sense his earnest manner of delivery."[3] Dr. Swallow discovers no trace of Methodism in the *Vicar of Wakefield*. It is strange that this

[1] To these should have been added the second stanza of Tony Lumpkin's song at the Three Pigeons, which is significant as coming twelve years later than the others.

[2] *Works*, ed. Cunningham, 3, 207.

[3] In *The Bee*, No. 7 (*Works* 3, 103–11), written in 1759, is an essay on "Eloquence" which contains the following sentences: "I have hitherto insisted more strenuously on that eloquence which speaks to the passions, as it is a species of oratory almost unknown in England. . . . . In the pulpit, in which the orator should chiefly address the vulgar, it seems strange that it should be entirely laid aside." And again: "When I think of the Methodist preachers among us, how seldom they are endued with common sense, and yet how often and how justly they affect their hearers, I cannot avoid saying within myself: Had these been bred gentlemen, and been endued with even the meanest share of understanding, what might they not effect! . . . . At present the enthusiasms of the poor are opposed to law; did law conspire with their enthusiasms, we should not only be the happiest nation upon earth, but the wisest also. Enthusiasm in religion, which prevails only among the vulgar, should be the chief object of politics. A society of enthusiasts, governed by reason among the great, is the most indissoluble, the most virtuous, and the most efficient of its own decrees that can be imagined."

passage did not suggest at once the sermon of Dr. Primrose to the prisoners in chap. xxvi. This discourse, though not "pathetic," is familiar and earnest, and singularly like many a page in Wesley's *Journal.* In its details Goldsmith's art is notably reminiscent; and, considering this fact, it is not at all improbable that the Vicar's sermon is an adapted reminiscence of some open-air Methodist discourse to a crowd of toughs and tramps, on the skirts of which this gentle Irishman pauses to listen, and gratify his passionate interest in such aspects of human life.

But besides preaching to the prisoners, the Vicar read them the service and the Bible, and instituted certain social reforms which were unheard of in the prisons of Goldsmith's time, except as they had just begun in sporadic cases under Wesley's iufluence. Wesley began early in his ministry to visit the prisoners. September 17, 1738, he writes: "The next day I went to the condemned felons in Newgate (London) and offered them free salvation." And on May 13, 1739: "Every morning I read prayers and preached at Newgate." On April 2, 1740: "Calling at Newgate (Bristol) in the afternoon, I was informed that the poor wretches under sentence of death were earnestly desirous to speak with me; but that it could not be." On February 3, 1753: "I visited one in the Marshalsea prison; a nursery of all manner of wickedness. O shame to man that there should be such a place, such a picture of hell upon earth!" On January 2, 1761—the year before Goldsmith began his novel, or perhaps the very year of its inception—Wesley wrote a letter to the *Chronicle* on prison reform. It begins: "Of all the seats of woe on this side hell, few, I suppose, exceed or even equal Newgate. If any region of horror could exceed it a few years ago, Newgate in Bristol did." A similar state of things is described by the Vicar. Wesley goes on to describe the reforms at Bristol, which were no doubt inspired by his influence. "Here is no fighting and brawling. . . . . The usual grounds of quarreling are removed. . . . . Here is no drunkenness suffered . . . . nor any whoredom." Similarly the Vicar had been repelled by the execrations, lewdness, and brutality of his fellow prisoners (chap. xxvi), and succeeded in reforming it. On Sunday, according to Wesley, the prisoners all "attend the public

service in the chapel." The Vicar says (chap. xxvii): "My design [of holding service] succeeded, and in less than six days some were penitent, and all attentive. It was now that I applauded my perseverance and address at thus giving sensibility to wretches divested of every moral feeling."

And lastly, Wesley describes the industrial reforms: "All possible care is taken to prevent idleness: those who are willing to work at their callings are provided with tools and materials. . . . . Among others, a shoemaker, a tailor, a brazier, and a coachmaker are working at their several trades." Then Goldsmith: "Their only employment was quarreling among each other, playing at cribbage, and cutting tobacco-stoppers. From this last mode of idle industry, I took the hint of setting such as chose to work, at cutting pegs for tobacconists and shoemakers, the proper wood being bought by general subscription, and, when manufactured, sold by my appointment." Wesley says: "If any thinks himself ill used, the cause is immediately referred to the keeper, who hears the contending parties face to face, and decides the affair at once." And finally Goldsmith: "I . . . . instituted fines for the punishment of immorality and rewards for peculiar industry. Thus in less than a fortnight I had reformed them into something social and humane, and had the pleasure of regarding myself as a legislator who had brought their native ferocity into friendship and obedience."

It was a constant rule of life with both Wesley and the Vicar "never to avoid the conversation of any man who seems to desire it; for if good, I might profit by his instruction; if bad, he might be assisted by mine;"[1] and both proceed on the assumption that "no man was past the hour of amendment" (chap. xxvi). Of the prisoners the Vicar says: "These people, however fallen, are still men; and that is a very good title to my affections" (chap. xxvii). Goldsmith doubtless read Wesley's letter in the *Chronicle*. He mentions the paper in the *Vicar* (chap. xix), and Mr. Dobson says (*Life of Goldsmith*, p. 90) that he took it in, but cites no authority.

[1] *Vicar of Wakefield*, chap. xxv; cf. Wesley's *Journal*, June 8, 1741; May 17, 1742; August 22, 26, 1743, etc.

Goldsmith's glorification of humble life in the *Vicar*, in the *Deserted Village*, and elsewhere suggests to Dr. Neuendorff the influence of Rousseau, especially through intercourse with Johnson's circle. No doubt Johnson and Goldsmith had more than once talked about Rousseau before the *Vicar* was written. The two men had certainly met by 1761—perhaps by 1759.[1] Rousseau's *Discourses* appeared in 1750 and 1754, and the *Social Contract* in 1762. In 1759 Johnson satirized the doctrine of living according to nature in chap. xxiii of *Rasselas*. But Goldsmith's sympathy with the lowly and downtrodden, like his sympathy with Wesleyanism, was rather a matter of heart than of doctrine. It seems to proceed from a natural Irish tenderness, modified and corrected perhaps by Johnson's British good sense. Two passages, slightly discrepant, but bearing upon this subject, may be cited. In 1759 he wrote, in No. 4 of *The Bee*, the "City Night-Piece" reprinted as Letter 117 in the *Citizen of the World*. He says: "The slightest misfortune of the great, the most imaginary uneasiness of the rich, are aggravated with all the power of eloquence, and held up to engage our attention and sympathetic sorrow. The poor weep unheeded, persecuted by every subordinate species of tyranny; and every law which gives others security becomes an enemy to them." But Mr. Burchell, in chap. xv of the *Vicar*, says: "The scholar may want prudence, the statesman may have pride, and the champion ferocity; but shall we prefer to these the low mechanic, who laboriously plods through life without censure or applause?" The diverting satire on levelers in the *Vicar*, chap. xix, is an obvious case in point.

Dr. Neuendorff has occasion to discuss the authorship of a short story in Smollet's *British Magazine* for July, 1760. It is called "The History of Miss Stanton," and fills three pages and a half. It begins:

Within ten miles of H., a town in the north of England, Mr. Stanton, a clergyman with a small fortune, had long resided; and by a continued perseverance in benevolence and his duty, was esteemed by the rich and

[1] Boswell's *Life of Johnson*, ed. Hill, I. 366, n. 1; Goldsmith, *The Bee*, No. 5; this essay is the famous "Reverie," written by November, 1759. It speaks of Johnson in a tone implying personal acquaintance.

beloved by the poor. He every evening sat by the wayside to welcome the passing stranger, where he was brought in for the night, and welcomed to a cup of cheerful ale and a glimmering fire. The parson inquired the news of the day, was solicitous to know how the world went, and, as the stranger told some new story, the entertainer would give some parallel instance from antiquity, or some occurrence of his youth.

One daughter he had, a girl of great beauty and understanding. Her education he undertook himself, and "taught his lovely scholar all he knew."[1] At length a sophisticated and adventurous stranger, named Dawson, insinuated himself into the good graces of the family, and laid siege to the girl's heart. After some days he lured her and her father to his splendid estate about forty miles away, where he succeeded eventually in ruining her. Her father confronted her with the rumor of her infamy, and, when she acknowledged it, secretly challenged Dawson to a duel with pistols.[2] In the encounter he fell, but the spectacle of Miss Stanton lamenting over the body of her father moved Dawson "to repair his foul offences by matrimony." The old man, who had only pretended to be dead, now rising up, claimed the performance of his promise, and the other had too much honor to refuse.

The analogy of this tale with certain parts of the *Vicar of Wakefield* is obvious. Appearing as it did in 1760, it either served as a source of suggestion to Goldsmith for his novel, or else, as seems more probable, he wrote it himself. In the latter case, it shows that he was meditating the subject of the *Vicar* in the first half of 1760, at least two years before the famous episode of its sale to the publishers to relieve the author from arrest.[3] Were it not for this extrinsic significance of the tale, an attempt to fasten so poor a production upon Goldsmith might well seem ungracious and unprofitable.

Goldsmith was writing frequently for the *British Magazine* in 1760. In 1765 the best of these contributions were collected and published separately. But he neither included in this col-

[1] Premonitory, it would seem, of the *Deserted Village*, l. 216.

[2] Cf. *Vicar*, chap. xvii.

[3] Whether the arrest took place in 1762 or 1764 it seems impossible to decide. Cf. Dobson, *Life of Goldsmith*.

lection, nor acknowledged in any other recorded way, "The History of Miss Stanton" as his own. Sir James Prior seems to have been the first to assign it to him. In his *Life of Goldsmith* (1, 350) he says: "Among the supposed contributions of Goldsmith, but less certain from being less finished, is a tale where we find something like the first rude germ of the *Vicar of Wakefield.* The catastrophe is indeed unnatural and abrupt, obviously hurried to a conclusion, and written probably when the press required an immediate supply of matter.[1]

Prior's reasons for assigning the story to Goldsmith are the following: the scene, which is laid in the north of England; the hero, a clergyman; his hospitality; his character and peculiarities, "sitting by the wayside to welcome the passing stranger," and replying to his news by some parallel instance from antiquity, or anecdote of his youth; various circumstances much in the spirit and manner of the novel and of the *Deserted Village.* He includes the story, with some fourteen other articles, for the first time among the essays in his edition of Goldsmith's works. Forster adopted Prior's view,[2] as also did Cunningham (*Goldsmith's Works*, 3, 278); but Mr. Dobson rejects it,[3] and is supported by Sir Leslie Stephen.[4]

Dr. Neuendorff has compared the story with other short stories by Goldsmith, namely with those in Letters 15, 48, 60, 62, and 87 of the *Citizen*, and "Alcander and Septimius" in the *Bee*, 1. He finds that in no significant respect does it differ from these. It resembles them in that the author mentions first the scene, and introduces the persons invariably with a remark upon their appearance and character. It contains few allusions to nature, few *sententiae* or metaphors. The number and use of the adjectives is the same as in the authentic tales.

A closer examination can leave virtually no doubt in the matter. In "Miss Stanton" we have a type of a distinct class of

[1] This last supposition is the more probable when it appears that four of the articles in the July number of the magazine were his—more than in any other one number—and that he was at this time also writing the *Citizen of the World* at the average rate of two letters a week. He composed slowly; see Forster, *Life*, Bk. 4, chap. ii.

[2] *Life of Goldsmith*, Bk. 3, chap. iii.

[3] *Life of Goldsmith*, p. 76.

[4] *Dictionary of National Biography*, Vol. 22, p. 89.

Goldsmith's stories, and it is with his stories of this class, and no other, that it should be compared. The subject is usually oriental or classical, and is invariably treated without humor. The style is wholly different from the charming, spontaneous manner of the author's better work, subsiding often into a formal monotone, which is artificial and balanced to the last degree. Stories of this class are "Zelis" (*Citizen*, 60), "Catherine Alexowna" (*Citizen*, 62), "Alcander and Septimius" (*Bee*, 1), and the following, which are not mentioned by Dr. Neuendorff: "Asem" (*Essays*, 3), "Hypatia" (*Bee*, 3), "Sabinus and Olinda" (*Bee*, 7), and "Matilda" (*Vicar*, chap. xxiii).

The obvious stylistic traits of "Miss Stanton" are common to the stories of this group, and appear in them to a similar degree. The most conspicuous trait is an extreme tendency, first, to balance of words, phrases, and sentences; secondly, to a triple construction of the same elements. A very small proportion of the sentences in each tale are devoid of either the triple or the double construction in some form.[1] The proportion of triple constructions to double constructions is very nearly one to three in every case except "Matilda." The commonest type of triple sentence in "Miss Stanton" has its last member developed to greater length than the other two, thus: "The parson inquired the news of the day, was solicitous to know how the world went, and, as the stranger told some new story, the entertainer would give some parallel instance from antiquity, or some occurrence of his youth." This type is about equally frequent in the authentic compositions. The sentences are uniformly declarative in all these tales, except of course, in the impassioned speeches. The resultant monotone is somewhat relieved by a small variety of subordinate clauses, of which the majority are introduced by *as*, *though*, *if*, *when*, the construction with *when* containing the really emphatic part of the sentence. Of the *as*-clauses, the proportion is virtually the same

[1] In any statistics the first fraction in each case applies to "Miss Stanton," the others to the stories mentioned in the list just given in the order there observed. The fractions represent the approximate proportion of instances of any phenomena to the number of words in the article. The proportion of sentences showing neither double nor triple constructions is 1/495, 1/315, 1/370, 1/310, 1/310, 1/140, 1/1140 (one instance), 1/305. This proportion seems the more uniform when we consider the brevity of the articles. The longest runs to about 2,800 words, the shortest to 600, and the average is about 1600.

in "Miss Stanton" and "Hypatia," and the construction is found in all but one of the stories. Of the *if*-clauses, five occur in "Miss Stanton," five in "Asem," a somewhat longer tale, but the construction does not appear in the others. The proportion of *though*-clauses, one of the commonest variations, is about the same as in three other tales, and in only one is it lacking. The proportion of *when*-clauses, also a common construction, is greater than in five other tales, and less than in two. Another variation, existing in about equal proportion in all of the tales, is an active or passive participle, either modifying the subject, or in absolute construction, often introduced before the verb, and sometimes before the subject. The proportion is 1/200, 1/200, 1/170, 1/200, 1/175, 1/280, 1/150.

The most convincing proof, however, lies in the resemblance of the subject-matter to that of authentic works. The resemblance to the *Vicar* is obvious. The resemblance to "Zelis," which must have appeared almost simultaneously with "Miss Stanton," has not, so far as I have observed, been noticed. Zelis was the only daughter of an officer in the army. Her "intercourse with the great," and her "affectation of grandeur" won her many lovers, but she had no fortune. A friend of her father's, about forty years old, "with nothing remarkable either in his person or address to commend him," won her confidence, if not her affections. But while he was pressing his suit, his marriage to another lady was announced. Zelis' father challenged him, and was killed. The episode closes with Zelis' lament over her father's body. Besides the general similarity of the tales, and the close resemblance between the villains, there is a striking correspondence of language in the speeches of the two fathers.

The first passage is from "Zelis":

"My dear, dear child, dear though you have forgotten your own honor and stained mine, I will yet forgive you: by abandoning virtue you have undone me and yourself: yet take my forgiveness with the same compassion I wish."

"My child, my child, ... why was this, thou dear lost deluded excellence? Why have you undone yourself and me? Had you no pity for this head that is grown gray in thy instruction?"

And again, Zelis says:

"I sat down and supporting his aged head in my lap, gazed upon the ghastly visage with an agony more poignant even than despairing madness. . . . . I called out upon the dead body that lay stretched before me, and in the agony of my heart asked why he could have left me thus! 'Why, my dear, my only papa, why could you ruin me thus and yourself forever!'"

"In an agony of distress she (Miss Stanton) fell lifeless upon the body stretched before her; but, soon recovering into an existence worse than annihilation, she expostulated with the body, and demanded a reason for his thus destroying all her happiness and his own."

The *Vicar of Wakefield*, as a matter of fact, is, like other of the poet's masterpieces, an elaborate composite of countless reminiscences from the poet's own life, from hearsay, from his earlier writings, and the works of others, particularly the novelists. Many cases in evidence have been noted by editors and scholars. The adventures of George Primrose, for example, are foreshadowed partly in Goldsmith's experiences on the Continent, in the *Enquiry into the Present State of Polite Learning*, in the essay on "The Adventures of a Strolling Player" (*Works*, ed. Cunningham, 3, 228), and in the *Life of Beau Nash*.[1] Again, in "Sabinus and Olinda" a suggestion of the prison-scene is subsequently to be much enriched, as we have seen, by a touch of Wesleyanism. There seems little reason to doubt then that "The History of Miss Stanton" is only one more of Goldsmith's many literary premonitions.

All four of the studies mentioned above point out reminiscence after reminiscence in the *Vicar of Wakefield* of contemporary novelists, particularly Fielding. Dr. Primrose is regarded as the counterpart of Parson Adams, almost trait for trait; Moses is a diminutive of Adams; Mrs. Primrose is Mrs. Adams; each has six children; Olivia and Thornhill resemble in some respects

[1] The familiar episode in which Miss Wilmot and Dr. Primrose recognize the lady's lover George in one of the actors in a performance of the *Fair Penitent*, is anticipated by a parallel incident in the *Life of Beau Nash*, where a mutual recognition occurs between Miss J. and her long-lost lover, as he after remote wanderings, degraded to the state of a strolling player, appears on the boards in a presentation of *The Conscious Lovers*. Cf. *Works*, 4, 69–71.

Pamela and Byron; in others, Clarissa and Lovelace. Tom Jones reappears as George Primrose, Sophia as Arabella Wilmot, Western as Mr. Wilmot, and Blifil as Thornhill. In plot, as well as in character, the *Vicar of Wakefield* proves to be a concoction of many borrowed ingredients collected from the novelists, and, though many readers of Goldsmith must rightly refuse to follow the resemblance to such infinitesimal details as those displayed by the scholars mentioned, nevertheless Goldsmith in his novel is certainly as reminiscent of other romancers as of his own earlier work. At the same time it is interesting to observe how little enthusiasm he felt for these writers and their works. Neither Fielding nor Richardson is mentioned among the contemporary aspirants to fame in the "Reverie," and Smollett, for whose magazine the article was written, comes in for only a perfunctory compliment. In the letter quoted at the beginning of this article (*Works*, ed. Cunningham, 4, 418), Goldsmith says: "Above all things let him (his nephew) never touch a romance or novel;" and continues with a severe indictment of fiction. In Letter 83 of the *Citizen* (*Works*, 2, 365), he says: "Every book can serve to make us more expert, except romances, and these are no better than the instruments of debauchery. They are dangerous fictions, where love is the ruling passion," and more to the same effect. In his *Life of Nash* (1761):

> Were I upon the present occasion to hold the pen of a novelist, I could recount some amours in which he was successful. . . . . But such adventures are easily written and as easily observed. The plan even of fictitious novel is quite exhausted. . . . . The gentleman begins at timid distance, grows more bold, becomes rude, till the lady is married or undone; such is the substance of every modern novel.[1]

Yet from such despised sources came many a suggestion for his own effort in the same field. Are we, then, to infer that he despised his own creation, that it was but a perfunctory attempt to turn a penny out of contemporary preferences in fiction? The perfunctory Goldsmith as revealed in several of his short tales already cited is far removed from Goldsmith the author of the *Vicar of Wakefield*. He was dissatisfied with his performance,

[1] *Works*, 4, 68, 69.

and found "a hundred faults in this thing."[1] But the loving care with which he dwelt upon each scene has mingled itself with every detail of the story, and has a singularly converting effect upon each detail and hence upon the work as a whole.

Goldsmith, then, was not inventive, nor fertile, nor varied, nor astonishing. Though he may sometimes be called a painter of *genre*, his work is essentially not *genre;* that is, it does not exhibit common life as common life. His greatest gift is one of transformation. The earthly he renders unearthly, the commonplace strange. It was this which he did for Goethe at Sesenheim.[2] The counterfeit presentment of real life which others furnished him he has touched with a kind of magic that fills it with delicate half-visionary charm, causing it to recede into an untraveled world

whose margin fades
For ever and for ever when we move.

CHARLES G. OSGOOD, JR.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

[1] Cf. the Preface.

[2] *Dichtung und Wahrheit*, Books 10 and 12; H. Solas, *Goldsmith's Einfluss in Deutschland im achtzehnten Jahrhundert*, pp. 34 ff.

DID "ASTROPHEL" LOVE "STELLA"

In 1591, the sonnet-sequence by Sir Philip Sidney, entitled "Astrophel and Stella," was produced surreptitiously by the publisher, Thomas Newman. Of the numerous interesting questions concerning these ostensible love-sonnets, the one I wish here to raise—or raise again, for it is an old one—is the question of their personal sincerity. Did "Astrophel" love "Stella"?

In general, I am not partial to this type of literary question. There is much in Browning's contention that the poet's self, his "house of life," is his castle, not penetrable by right or power of any gossip-mongering critic. To that class he replies scornfully, "You can't get in anyway"!

> whoso desires to penetrate
> Deeper, must dive by the spirit-sense—
> No optics like yours, at any rate!

But it is hard for an ordinary human being not to ask after any story, "Is it really true?" And the world at large is credulous, inclining to take people—even poets—at their word. Heine certainly gave a most undeserved compliment, when he said—

> Diese Welt glaubt nicht an Flammen,
> Und sie nimmt's für Poesie.

On the contrary, the world—at least the biographers, critics, and schoolgirls—dubious about *Poesie*, has calmly taken it all for *Flammen*, forgetting old Giles Fletcher's prudent consideration that "a man may write of love and not be in love; as well as of husbandry and not go to the plough; or of witches and be none; or of holiness and be flat profane."[1] Are we to believe Sidney, or not, when he protests—

> know! that I, in pure simplicity,
> Breathe out the flames which burn within my heart,
> Love only reading unto me this art. —xxviii.

[1] Licia (1593), Epist. Ded.

Are we to believe Dante, or not, when he protests so similarly—

> Io mi son un che, quando
> Amor mi spira, noto, ed a quel modo
> Che detta dentro, vo significando. — *Purg.*, xxiv, 52–54.

Certainly, what each says is *Poesie;* but is it *Flammen?* While there is imagination, there is doubt. Coleridge may be right; a poet may be a poet just because he can compel us—nay, fool us—into "a willing suspension of disbelief" in his sincerity. A feigned artlessness, the profession of "pure simplicity," so far from reassuring, should give pause. Bret Harte's Heathen Chinee was most artless and simple.

So, if "pure simplicity" is a device within the capacity of the most ordinary actor, to convey the illusion of an overmastering passion is the triumph of a great artist. No one would deny this proposition in the abstract; yet how many critics have spun out heated arguments upon an implied denial! Listen to Swinburne defending the "sincerity" of Shakspere's Sonnets; or to cooler-headed Jusserand answering, only yesterday, my own titular question: "Like most of the poets of his time, Sidney *could* draw love songs from his imagination; he has strewn his prose 'Arcadia' with such. No one can read them without noticing the difference, and without concluding that, in truth, Astrophel loved Stella" (*Lit. Hist. Eng. People*, II [1906], 396, 397). By the same token, if poetic quality be the test of literal reality, then Juliet's love must be the reality, and Shakspere's own "Will" sonnets to the Dark Lady the fiction, "for no one can read them without noticing the difference, and without concluding that in truth," Juliet really lived and loved Romeo, and Shakspere—after such bad and plagiaristic puns—could never have loved the Dark Lady!

Another up-to-date critic, Mr. Sidney Lee, reads Sidney's sonnets, and concludes quite differently from M. Jusserand.

> Although it is probable [he writes (*Eliz. Sonnets*, Introd. xliii)] that Sidney's pursuit of the favour of Lady Rich, a coquettish friend of his youth who married another, led him to turn sonneteer, the imitative quality that . . . . is visible throughout Sidney's ample effort, ... destroys most of those specious pretensions to autobiographic confessions which the unwary reader may discern in them.

But, one may ask, does the "imitative quality" of Milton's tender sonnet to his dead wife—following as it does in its conception a similar sonnet by Bernardino Rota ("In lieto, e pien di reverenzia aspetto")—make its autobiographic pretensions specious? or, more broadly, may not a man go a-wooing or a-mourning as well in a borrowed song as in a borrowed suit?

Thus from internal evidence, these two representative critics—and I take them simply as representative—deduce opposite, and as I believe unnecessary, conclusions from the same premises. External evidence likewise reads double to them.

> Sidney's poetic worship of Stella [comments Mr. Lee (*loc. cit.*)] became a conventional theme in Elizabethan poetry, and enjoyed a popularity only second to that of Petrarch's poetic worship of Laura. The *locus classicus* for its treatment is the collection of elegies, entitled *Astrophel*, to which Spenser was the chief contributor. That volume was dedicated to Sidney's widow, and his sister, the Countess of Pembroke, wrote a poem for it. Throughout the work, Sidney's celebration of Stella is accounted his most glorious achievement in literature. The dedication of *Astrophel* to Sidney's wife deprives of serious autobiographical significance his description in the sonnets of his pursuit of Stella's affections.

So Mr. Lee; now M. Jusserand:

> Sidney's sonnets . . . . came out . . . . after his death; and the world knew then how deep had been the passion that "Astrophel" had felt for "Stella." And Stella, to the inconvenience of a very modern school of critics, according to whom Sidney had described imaginary loves, the true Stella, Penelope Devereux, Lady Rich, in spite of her faults, more and more visible, in spite of her far from exemplary life, remained, for the friends of the Muses, a sacred and semi-divine being, for no other reason than that she had been Sidney's love, the subject of his verse. The opinion of contemporaries is perhaps worth as much as that of the critics of three hundred years later [*loc. cit.*].

Mr. Lee is speaking from the English point of view; M. Jusserand from the French. It is just barely possible—I will not emphasize the suggestion—that difference of nationality may to some degree account for their different way of taking, for instance, the so-called *locus classicus* of the celebration of Astrophel's pursuit of Stella, Spenser's elegy dedicated to Lady Essex, Sidney's

widow that was. But had they examined the elegy itself more closely, they would have found in it, I think, means of reconcilement.

To begin with, Spenser's dedication was distinctly less to the widow of the dead Sidney than to the wife of the living Essex. The elegy, whenever written, was published in 1595, when Spenser was assiduously courting the patronage of Essex, just victorious at Cadiz, and now reigning favorite. Assuredly, Spenser would have taken no chances of wounding Lady Essex's sensibilities; and despite M. Jusserand's citation of the indulgence shown to Chateaubriand's outspokenness "concerning his own extremely real loves," I doubt if an Englishwoman would have welcomed even in those more "spacious days" the frank celebration of her late husband's infidelity, and her rival's triumph. Be that as it may, the apparently unregarded thing is that Spenser implies no marital infidelity, raises no question of real rivalry. Here is the gist of his indictment:

> Stella the faire, the fairest star in skie,
> As faire as Venus or the fairest faire,
> (A fairer star saw never living eie)
> Shot her sharp pointed beames through purest aire.
> Her he did love, her he alone did honor,
> His thoughts, his rimes, his songs were all upon her.
>
> To her he vowd the service of his daies,
> On her he spent the riches of his wit;
> For her he made hymnes of immortall praise,
> Of onely her he sung, he thought, he writ. . . . .
>
> Ne her with ydle words alone he wowed,
> And verses vaine, (yet verses are not vaine)
> But with brave deeds to her sole service vowed,
> And bold atchievements her did entertaine.

Undoubtedly, Spenser says that Astrophel did love Stella—but *how?* was there not a manner of loving recognized at the time as capable of sincerity, even of fervency, and yet not in wedlock, and still not illicit? Of course, everyone at all familiar with the Renaissance will recognize that I mean platonic love. I have not time here to discuss in detail the revival of Platonism, sys-

tematized as a scientific gospel in the Florentine academy of Ficino and Pico della Mirandola, and as a social gospel in the *Asolani* of Bembo and the *Cortegiano* of Castiglione, and during the following century divulgated throughout Europe. In the Renaissance and after, the social gospel of platonic love was often treated with levity or irony; but we cannot understand the Renaissance, unless we remember that many serious men and women took the notion seriously, almost religiously. Castiglione, in fact, speaking through Bembo, makes platonic love the virtual religious basis of his ideal character, the power *in* ourselves which makes for righteousness. Moreover, platonic love was for him, and for others like him, more than a vague term for an honest intimacy between men and women. It was a cult with rules and limitations, duties and rewards, as sharply defined as those of the mediaeval chivalric love-cult, from which indeed, fused with Platonism proper, the Renaissance platonic love-cult derived. Love is defined as desire awakened by beauty, and by progressive illumination passes from sensible beauty to spiritual, and from spiritual beauty to divine—from lust to love, and from love to religion. The duty of the lover is service and honor—*prouesse* and *courtoisie* adapted to the new social environment of the court; the reward of the right lover is intellectual communion with his lady by conversation (*entretiens du coeur*)—"risi piacevoli, i ragionamenti domestici e secreti, il motteggiare, scherzare, toccar la mano" (Castiglione)—and supreme spiritual communion in the kiss, the platonic sacrament; for the kiss, says Castiglione, "is rather union of soul than of body, since it has power to draw the soul to itself, and separate it from the body" ("il bascio si pò più presto dir congiungimento d'anima che di corpo, perchè in quella ha tanta forza che la tira a sè, e la separa dal corpo").

Now in the light of this quintessential doctrine, Spenser's account of Astrophel's "pursuit" of Stella becomes quite different from the vulgar *liaison* which shocks Mr. Lee, and is condoned by M. Jusserand "quia poeta multum amavit," *et bene dixit.* Spenser's opening figure, the likening of Stella's influence to "beames" "shot" from "fairest star in skie," recalls the most exquisite epitome of platonic love in Michelangelo's

Dalle più alte stelle
Discende uno splendore
Che'l desir tira a quelle;
E qui si chiama amore.

(From highest stars above
Downward a radiance flows,
Drawing desire to those;
And here men call it love.)

The rest is the declaration of Sidney's "service" with "honor," in phrases virtually identical with Spenser's own explicit utterance of Platonism in his *Hymne to Love* (especially vss. 204–24). And in conformity with this interpretation of Spenser's elegy is the testimony of Matthew Roydon in the same series of elegies, that

Above all others this (Sidney) is hee
Which erst approoved in his song,
That love and honour might agree,
And that pure love will do no wrong.

Spenser and Roydon, at least, read Astrophel and Stella as an expression ultimately of pure platonic love, and so acclaimed it. Such love was acceptedly licit toward a married woman; indeed, in theory, it was most fitly so directed; since the platonic, like the chivalric, love theorists held that their union of pure spirit was incompatible with the grosser union of matrimony, especially as for the noble class primarily concerned marriage was so largely a matter "of convenience." There was accordingly no theoretically valid reason for Lady Sidney to be jealous of Stella, or for Lord Rich to be jealous of Astrophel, though Sidney once or twice seems to imply that he was (cf. xxiv, xxxvii, lxxviii).

But Castiglione, more practical-minded than Bembo, made one prudent requirement for the platonic lover: he must be no longer young. Castiglione's ideal lovers were foreordained to be Michelangelo at sixty-three "loving" Vittoria Colonna at forty-eight. At the same time, Castiglione will pardon the young passionate lover, provided he will rise from the ashes of his dead passions to a higher love; and what Castiglione says on this point curiously fits Sidney's situation.

. . . . I believe that, although sensual love in every age of life is an evil (*malo*), yet in youths it is excusable, and even to some degree permis-

sible (*licito*); for though it entails sufferings, perils, fatigues, and many unhappinesses, still there are many who to win the favor of loved ladies do excellent deeds, which although not directed to a good end, are yet in themselves good; and so from much bitterness extract a little sweetness, and through the adversities they endure recognize at last their error. . . . . I pardon them their base love [he goes on] provided that in it they show gentleness (*gentilezza*), courtesy, and valor . . . . ; and when they are no longer of youthful age, they wholly abandon it, leaving that sensual desire, as the lowest rung of the ladder by which man climbs unto the true love.

At the beginning of the Sonnets, the young Sidney sees the better, yet cannot but follow the worse, love.

> It is most true—that eyes are formed to serve
> The inward light; and that the heavenly part
> Ought to be King; from whose rules, who doth swerve,
> (Rebels to Nature) strive for their own smart. . . . .
> True—that true beauty, virtue is indeed;
> Whereof this beauty can be but a shade,
> Which elements with mortal mixture breed:
> True—that on earth, we are but pilgrims made;
> And should in soul, up to our country move:
> True—and yet true that I must Stella love. —v.

And his love, he admits, is not only thus imperfect, being of a mortal beauty (though participant in the immortal "elements"), but also his love is stained with passion.

> Alas! have I not pain enough? my friend!
> Upon whose breast, a fiercer gripe doth tire,
> Than did on him who first stole down the fire;
> While Love on me, doth all his quiver spend:
> But with your rhubarb words ye must contend
> To grieve me worse in saying, "That Desire
> Doth plunge my well-formed soul even in the mire
> Of sinful thoughts, which do in ruin end."

In the following sestette he protests indeed a pure love—

> If that be sin, which doth the manners frame
> Well stayed with truth in word, and faith of deed;
> Ready of wit, and fearing nought but shame:
> If that be sin, which in fixt hearts doth breed
> A loathing of all loose unchastity:
> Then love is sin, and let me sinful be! —xiv.

This is love on the high platonic, as well as high human, level, in the spirit of Michelangelo's lines, or Donne's tribute to the Countess of Bedford—

Madam,
You have refined me, and to worthiest things.

But as often Sidney's mood is the rebellious appeal—

O give my passions leave to run their race!

The influence of Stella, of the "Star," is that of the radiant stars which Michelangelo describes. In sonnets lxi, lxii, she makes her own "sweet breathed defence"—

That who indeed infelt affection bears,
So captives to his saint both soul and sense;
That wholly hers, all selfness he forbears:
Thence his desires he learns, his life's course thence.

The term "saint" was peculiarly affected by the adherents of the "new religion in love," as Suckling was later to dub Platonism. This sublimated love Stella will reciprocate—

Late tired with woe, even ready for to pine
With rage of love, I called my love "unkind!"
She in whose eyes love, though unfelt, doth shine
Sweetly said, "That I, true love in her should find."
I joyed; but straight thus watered was my wine.
"That love she did, but loved a love not blind;
Which would not let me, whom she loved, decline
From nobler course, fit for my birth and mind:
And therefore by her love's authority,
Willed me, these tempests of vain love to fly;
And anchor fast myself on Virtue's shore." —lxii.

For awhile he is still rebellious.

No more! my Dear! no more these counsels try!
O give my passions leave to run their race!
Let Fortune lay on me her worst disgrace!
Let folk o'ercharged with brain, against me cry!
Let clouds bedim my face, break in mine eye!
Let me no steps but of lost labour trace!
Let all the earth in scorn recount my case;
But do not will me from my love to fly! —lxxiv.

Then, of a sudden, he ecstatically rejoices in her conditional love—

For Stella hath with words (where faith doth shine),
Of her high heart given me the monarchy:
I! I! O I may say that she is mine.
And though she give but thus conditionally
This realm of bliss, "while virtuous course I take:"
No kings be crowned, but they some covenant make. —lxix.

He recognizes in her the true *platonique*—

. . . . not content to be perfection's heir,
Thyself doth strive all minds that way to move;
Who mark in thee, what is in thee most fair:
So while thy beauty draws the heart to love,
As fast thy virtue bends that love to good.[1] —lxxi.

"Quiet she"—like the *primum mobile*, drawing all by divine grace-giving grace; "he, passion-rent" still, but ever more subdued to

Service and Honour, Wonder with Delight,
Fear to offend, Will worthy to appear,
Care shining in mine eyes, Faith in my sprite:
These things are left me by my only Dear. —lxxii.

And as reward for their observance, the sacramental kiss is bestowed—

. . . . Kiss! which souls, even souls together ties
By links of love. . . . . —lxxxi.

In this realization of Castiglione's like-justified reward is the climax of the sonnet-drama, at least as posthumously published. The rest is complaint for misunderstandings, absence, sickness, and the ever outbreaking of the lover's lower self; until at last he despairs. But the sequence is manifestly on Petrarchan lines, and Petrarch ends in reconcilement with self, and with God; so we may well regard two other famous sonnets by Sidney as intended for the epilogue to his sonnet-drama.[2] In the first,

[1] The function of the "society" platonique of the period was twofold: (1) to influence through intimate relations a particular servant; (2) to diffuse her influence more formally through a coterie of "servants." (Cf. J. B. Fletcher, "Précieuses at the Court of Charles I," *Jl. of Comp. Lit.*, Vol. I (1903), p. 120.) Lady Rich fulfilled both functions: besides having her "*chevalier intime*," Sidney, she received poetic incense from a coterie of Elizabethan writers. R. Barnfield dedicated to her his "Affectionate Shepherd" (1594), as a "meane offering" to her "Iuorie Shrine:" Bartholomew Yong dedicated to her his translations, both of Montemayor's *Diana* and of Guazzo's *Civile Conversazione*, Book IV; John Davies of Hereford and Henry Constable addressed sonnets to her.

[2] Cf. also Lee, *op. cit.*, p. xlvi.

apostrophizing Desire, he protests to have at last overcome its baleful power; in the second, he rises above even purified love of mortal beauty to the love of the divine "elements" themselves of beauty, in God. The two sonnets at once round up the dramatic sequence by the triumph of Stella, the star of love, seen first as Woman, then as God, and epitomize the platonic principle of evolution at its highest. I therefore venture to quote them, familiar as they are.

Thou blind man's mark! thou fool's self-chosen snare!
Fond fancy's scum! and dregs of scattered thought!
Band of all evils! cradle of causeless care!
Thou web of will! whose end is never wrought.
Desire! Desire! I have too dearly bought,
With price of mangled mind, thy worthless ware!
Too long! too long asleep thou hast me brought!
Who should my mind to higher things prepare;
But yet in vain, thou hast my ruin sought!
In vain, thou mad'st me to vain things aspire!
In vain, thou kindlest all thy smoky fire!
For virtue hath this better lesson taught.
Within myself, to seek my only hire:
Desiring nought, but how to kill Desire.

Leave me, O love! which reachest but to dust!
And thou, my mind! aspire to higher things!
Grow rich in that, which never taketh rust!
Whatever fades, but fading pleasure brings.
Draw in thy beams, and humble all thy might
To that sweet yoke, where lasting freedoms be!
Which breaks the clouds, and opens forth the light
That doth both shine, and give us sight to see.
O take fast hold! Let that light be thy guide!
In this small course which birth draws out to death:
And think how evil becometh him to slide,
Who seeketh heaven, and comes of heavenly breath!
Then farewell, world! Thy uttermost I see!
Eternal Love, maintain Thy love in me!

It may be conceded that, as Mr. Lee insists, both of these sonnets have an "imitative quality." Of the joint theme of both, one prototype among many is thus translated by George Santayana from Lorenzo de' Medici—

As a lamp, burning through the waning night,
When the oil begins to fail that fed its fire
Flares up, and in its dying waxes bright
And mounts and spreads the better to expire;
So in this pilgrimage and earthly flight
The ancient hope is spent that fed desire,
And if there burn within a greater light
'Tis that the vigil's end approacheth nigher.
Hence thy last insult, Fortune, cannot move,
Nor death's inverted torches give alarm;
I see the end of wrath and bitter moan.
My fair Medusa into sculptured stone
Turns me no more, my Siren cannot charm.
Heaven draws me up to its supernal love.[1]

Mr. Santayana speaks of thought here rising "to the purest sphere of tragedy and of religion." Assuredly, the same comment may be passed upon Sidney's "thought." Neither as mere clever *jeux d'esprit* of an Italianate *virtuoso*, nor as the *chronique scandaleuse*, moving but shameless, of an Elizabethan Chateaubriand, were the sonnets of Astrophel to Stella felt by Sidney's contemporaries; but as rising "to the purest sphere of tragedy and of religion." The silliness of Renaissance platonic love as a fad and fancy of cynical beaux and brainless coquettes was as patent to our ancestors as to ourselves: many before John Cleveland similarly counselled such "Platonicks"—

For shame, thou everlasting wooer. . . . .
For shame, you pretty female elves,
Cease thus to candy up yourselves!

But Castiglione's serenely dignified gentleman was no candified fop; if anything, he might prove a little over-serious, a little of a "mollycoddle," in these days. The sixteenth century produced two notable incarnations of him in his religious love—the old Michelangelo and the young Sidney. Both—but one in beautiful, sad serenity, the other after struggle and fever—are able at last to say to the lady of their ideal:

Beata l'alma ove non corre tempo
Per te s' è fatta a contemplare Dio.
(Blessed the soul where runs no longer time
By thee empowered to contemplate God.)

[1] *Poetry and Religion*, New York, 1900, p. 135.

If Penelope Devereux could so "empower" at the last Sidney, we can well understand with M. Jusserand how she, "in spite of her faults, more and more visible, in spite of her far from exemplary life, remained, for the friends of the Muses, a sacred and semi-divine being, for no other reason than that she had been Sidney's love." Only, this "love" we must understand as Sidney's contemporaries understood it, and *not* according to "the critics of three hundred years later." And furthermore, if we are to take Sidney at his word at all, we should assuredly take him at his own word, and not according to our opinion of what a twentieth-century man would have done or said in his place. It is grossly unhistorical to dismiss an ideal as silly or prurient three centuries ago, because it became so later. Of course, Sidney may be lying to conceal an adulterous adventure, or—to speak more euphemistically—feigning. There is no disputing about the *possibility* of a fact; and—to repeat another truism—while there is imagination, there is doubt. But at least the burden of proof is on the doubter; and he will, I surmise, find it a hard task to rebut the actual evidence in Sidney's character, notably serious and chivalrous—"the president of nobleness and chevalree"[1]—capable of fanatic devotion to an idea, in the contemporary conception of him as the "right courtier" of Castiglione's stamp, and in the contemporary unambiguous exaltation of his love for "Stella" as of the "new religion in love."

JEFFERSON B. FLETCHER

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

[1] Spenser, *Shep. Cal. Proemium*

STUDIES IN GERMANIC STRONG VERBS. II

16. Grīsan

OE. *ā-grīsan* 'shudder, fear,' pret. not found, pp. **grisen* in *an-grisen-līce* 'terribly,' ME. *grīsen*, *a-grīsen* (st. and wk.) 'fear, tremble or shudder with fear,' MDu. *grīsen* 'een afkeer hebben, have an aversion to,' pret. *of-grees*, early Du. 16th cent. *grijsen* (st. and wk.) correspond to MLG. *grīsen* (*gresen*) wk. 'schaudern,' EFries. *grīsen* 'grausen, schaudern, Graus oder Schauder und Abscheu machen, etc.,' related to MLG. *grīs* 'schaudernd ängstlich,' *grese* 'Schauder, Grausen,' *greselhaftich* 'zusammenfahrend; (von Flüssigkeiten) zu gefrieren, zu gerinnen beginnend,' EFries. *grīsel* 'Schauder, Frieren, Frösteln, Grusel,' *grillen* 'frösteln, zittern' (*-ll-* from *-zl-*), MDu. *grijselick*, OFries. *grislik*, OE. *angrislic* 'terrible, horrible,' NE. *grisly*, OHG. *grīsenlich* 'grausig,' etc., Germ. base *grīs-*, with which compare EFries. *grītjen* 'schaudern, ekeln, frösteln,' *griddeln* 'schaudern, frösteln zittern.'

These point to a base *ĝhrei-* in Skt. *hríṣ* 'Scham,' *jihréti* 'schämt sich,' i. e. 'zieht sich zurück,' *hrīṇa-s*, *hrīta-s* 'beschämt, verlegen,' *hrīti-ṣ* 'Scham,' *hríka-s* 'verschämt,' *hrēpayati* 'beschämt,' with which compare *ĝheres-* in Skt. *hárṣate*, *hṛ́ṣyati* 'wird starr, sträubt sich, schaudert, ist erregt,' Lat. *horreo*, *horror*, etc.

17. Hīban

OFries. **hīva*, NFries. (Wangeroog) *hīw* 'aufgehen' (von der Hefe), Dan. *hive* 'keuchen':—early Dan. *hibe* 'trachten, streben,' Norw. dial. *hīpa* 'trachten nach, gaffen,' Sw. dial. *hipa* 'gaffen; keuchen,' Sw. *häpen* 'erstaunt, bestürzt,' Norw. *hipen*, *hippen* 'neugierig,' etc. These are from a Germ. base *hīb-*, *hīp-*, *hipp-* 'sich schnell bewegen: schnappen, nach Luft schnappen; trachten, streben, etc.,' pre-Germ. *k̂ībh-*, *k̂ībhn-*: Skt. *çíbham* 'rasch, schnell,' *çíbhya-s* 'rasch fahrend,' Goth. *haifsts* 'Streit, Zank,' ON. *heipt* 'Hass, Rache,' *hǣst* 'violent, severe; violence,' etc. (cf. Zupitza, *Gutturale* 182).

A synonymous base *k̂īgh-*, *kīghn-* occurs in Skt. *çīghrá-s* 'rasch, schnell,' OE. *hīgian* 'strive for, be intent on,' NE. *hie* 'hasten' (cf. Kluge and Lutz 105), Du. *hijgen*, EFries., MLG. *hīgen* 'schwer atmen, keuchen,' pop. Norw. *hīka* 'trachten nach, streben,' Sw. dial. *hikja* 'schwer atmen,' Dan. *hige* 'nach Luft schnappen,' earlier also 'trachten nach,' *hikke* 'schluchzen,' ON. *hixta* 'nach Luft schnappen, röcheln,' etc.

18. HIJSCHEN

Du. *hijschen* 'hoist, set up (sail, flag)':—LG. *hissen*, Sw. *hissa*, NE. *hoise*, *hoist*, etc., LG. *hisse*, Flem. *hijse* 'hoisting machine.' Of uncertain origin (cf. Franck 370; Kluge s. v. *hissen;* Tamm 308). Perhaps primarily 'move suddenly, move with a jerk' and related to MLG. *hissen*, *hessen* 'hetzen, jagen,' *heist* 'Heftigkeit,' OFries. *haest* 'Eile,' Goth. *haifsts* 'Streit, Zank,' Skt. *çíbham* 'rasch, schnell' (cf. no. 17).

Compare the synonymous *k̂īgh-*: Skt. *çīghrá-s* 'rasch, schnell,' OE. *hīgian* 'strive for,' NE. *hie*, etc. (no. 17), MHG. *hickeln* 'springen, hüpfen,' prov. Eng. *hick* 'hop, spring,' *hike* 'swing, toss, throw,' Am. slang *hike* 'a quick or sudden movement,' 'move or go quickly,' NE. *hitch* 'move by jerks, hobble; tr. pull up, raise by jerks, fasten.'

19. RĪVEN

MDu. *gerīven* 'accommodate, serve, oblige' (wk.) has once a pret. *ghereef* (Du. *gerijven*, *gerieven* wk.), EFries. *gerīfen* 'passen, nützen, helfen, dienen, befriedigen,' pret. *gerēf*, etc., NFries. *ʒərīw* (wk.), pp. *ʒərīwīn:*—MDu. *gherief*, Du. *gerief*, *gerijf*, EFries. *gerīf* 'Bequemlickkeit, Nutzen, Vorteil,' MLG. *gerīf* 'Bequemlichkeit,' *gerīflik* 'passend, bequem,' etc., related to ON. *rífr* 'freigebig,' *rífligr* 'freigebig; vorteilhaft,' OE. *rīf* 'abundant, frequent, rife,' MLG. *rīve* 'freigebig; reichlich,' ON. *reifa* 'jemand mit etwas begaben, beschenken' (cf. Siebs, *Paul's Grdr.* I², 1308).

These are probably from pre-Germ. *reip-* or *rīp-*, base *rēi-* in Skt. *rayí-ṣ* 'Habe, Besitz,' *rēvánt-* 'reich, reichlich, prächtig,' *rās* 'Gut, Reichtum,' *ráti*, *rásatē* 'gibt, verleiht, gewährt,' *rātí-ṣ* 'bereitwillig, günstig; Gunst, Gabe,' *rádhas* 'Gunst, Gabe, Freige-

bigkeit,' Av. *rāδah-* 'Darbringung,' Skt. *rādhnóti, rádhyati* 'kommt zurecht, macht fertig, bringt zu stande, gewinnt,' *rādhayati* 'bringt zu stande, befriedigt,' Goth. *garēdan* 'auf etwas bedacht sein,' *undrēdan* 'gewähren,' etc., *raidjan* 'anordnen, festsetzen,' etc., Lith. *rėju* 'lege in Ordnung,' Lat. *reor*, etc. (cf. IE. a^x*:* $a^x i$*:* $a^x u$ 43 f.). Cf. Persson, *Studien* 46; Fick II⁴, 225; Brugmann, *Grdr.* II, 1047; Walde, *Et. Wb.* 521, 523.

20. RĪSAN

OE. *gerīsan* 'befit,' OS. *girīsan* 'gehören, sich gehören, sich geziemen' correspond to a weak verb in OHG. *girīsan*, MHG. *gerīsen* 'ziemen, zukommen, oportere.' They seem not to be a compound of OE. *rīsan* 'rise,' OHG. *rīsan* 'steigen; fallen,' which actually does occur in MHG. *gerīsen* 'fallen, niederfallen,' MLG. *gerīsen* 'entstehen.' Here belong OE. *gerisenlic, -rislic* 'suitable, convenient,' *gerisne* 'proper, suitable, convenient,' *gerisnian* 'suit, accord,' OHG. *gerislīh, giristlīh* 'geziemend, passend,' etc.

These are perhaps rather from *rēi-* in Skt. *ráti, rásatē* 'gibt, verleiht, gewährt,' MDu. *gerīven*, EFries. *gerīfen* 'passen, nützen, helfen,' etc. Cf. no. 19.

21. DRĪHAN

Goth. *preihan* 'drängen':—Goth. *preihsl* 'Bedrängnis,' *faihupraihns* 'Reichtum.' These are supposed to come from a base *trenq-* in Lith. *treñkti* 'dröhnend stossen,' ON. *þryngua* 'pressen, (be)drängen; anfüllen, schwellen,' etc. This is, of course, quite possible. But it is just as probable that *preihan* comes from pre-Germ. **tréiqō*. Compare* *praigjan* 'press, urge' in OS. *thrēgian*, MLG. *dreigen*, MDu. *drēghen, dreighen*, EFries. *drēgen* 'drohen,' and MHG. *drīhe* 'Stecknadel, Handgerät des Flechtens und Webens,' which are from the base *terēi-:* Gk. *τείρω* 'wear out, afflict, distress,' Lat. *'trīvi, trītus;* Lith. *trinu* 'reibe,' *trynė* 'Blase,' *tráimotis* 'sich umherstossen; beschmutzen,' Pruss. *trinie* 'droht;' Lith. *trėszkiu, tráiszkau* 'quetsche, presse,' OSw. *prēsker* 'widerspenstig;' OE. *þrāstan* 'twist; press; torture, afflict,' *þrīst* ('pressing forward'), 'bold, brave; shameless,' Lat. *trīstis* ('oppressed'), afflicted, sad;' Gk. *τρίβω* 'rub, thresh, grind; bruise;

wear out, spend, use,' τριβή 'rubbing; wearing away, spending; practice; object of care,' ChSl. *trěba* 'negotium,' *tr˘bŭ* 'notwendig;' Lith. *trypiù* 'stampfe, trample,' ON. *þrífa* 'ergreifen, erfassen,' in both senses from 'press;' Lat. *inter-trīgo* 'chafing of the skin,' etc. (cf. IE. a^x: a^xi: a^xu 60 ff.).

22. PWĪNAN

OE. *þwīnan* 'dwindle' I have explained before (*AJP.* XXI, 180 f.) as representing a pre-Germ. *tu̯īn-* from *tu̯ī-*, a low grade of *tāu-i̯o-* in Skt. *tóya-m* 'Wasser,' OHG. *douwen* 'auftauen, zergehen; verdauen,' etc. This base *tāu-i̯o-*, *tāu-* I regarded (following others) as a possible derivative of *tā-* in ChSl. *tajati* 'sich, auflösen, schmelzen, vergehen,' Lat. *tābeo*, etc. What I then considered and still consider as a possibility is held by Lidén, *IF.* XIX, 348 ff., to be a certainty. To me it seems just as probable that OE. *þwīnan*, etc., may be related to Gk. σίνομαι, σίννομαι (from **tu̯iniomai*) 'hurt, damage, waste, plunder,' σίνος 'hurt, mischief, plague,' σιναρός 'hurtful; hurt, damaged,' etc. But this combination Lidén rejects, "wegen der weit abliegenden Bedeutung."

That the difference in meaning here does not preclude this combination, witness the following: Skt. *kṣárati* 'fliesst, gleitet, schwindet; giesst, strömt aus,' Gk. φθείρω 'corrupt, spoil, ruin, put to death, kill, slay, destroy.'—Gk. ἀλαπάζω 'empty, drain: waste, slay.'—Gk. χέω 'pour out, scatter,' Lith. *žuti* 'umkommen,' *žavìnti* 'umbringen': Lat. *fundo* 'pour, pour out, shed; scatter, cast, hurl, cast down, etc.,' OE. *gēotan* 'pour, shed, cast; flow,' *ā-gēotan* 'flow out; pour out, shed (blood); destroy; deprive, etc.,' *gīetan* 'destroy,' Lith. *žudýti* 'umbringen, töten,' Lett. *fa'udēt* 'verderben, verlieren,' *fust* 'verschwinden, verloren gehen' (cf. author, *Mod. Lang. Notes* XV, 96; Prellwitz, *Et. Wb.*[2] 505; Holthausen, *IF.* XX, 327, repeats my explanation).—Skt. *jala-m* 'Wasser,' OHG. *quellan* 'quellen,' Skt. *galati* 'fällt herab, träufelt herab,' *galita-s* 'verschwunden, gewichen,' Welsh *aballu* 'vergehen,' Ir. *atbail* 'stirbt,' Lith. *gãlas* 'Ende,' Pruss. *gallan*, *golis* 'Tod,' OE. *cwelan* 'die,' *cwealm* 'death, pestilence, destruction,' etc. (cf. IE. a^x: a^xi: a^xu 99). I here combine two groups of

words which have been unnecessarily separated (cf. Zupitza, *Gutturale* 85 with references).

Now though OE. *þwīnan*, pre-Germ *tu̯īno-* may represent the low grade of a base *tāu-i̯o-* from *tā-u̯o-* from *tā-*, it is just as possible that it was formed from a base *teu-* as a rime-word to OE. *dwīnan*, etc., from *dheu-*, *dhū-* in Skt. *dhūnóti* 'schüttelt, schüttelt aus, ab, entfernt, etc.,' *dhūyátē* 'wird geschüttelt,' ON. *deyia* 'sterben,' *duína* 'diminish, cease,' OE. *dwīnan* 'dwindle, waste away' (cf. *Color-Names* 34, 89 f.; IE. a^x: a^xi: a^xu 75; so also Lidén, *Armenische Studien* 41).

Similarly we have a base *teu-*, *teu̯ə-*, which must have denoted rapid motion. Perhaps 'rush' expresses the primary meaning in its intransitive use, and 'move violently, thrust' in its transitive use. The base I refer to is in Skt. *tavīti* 'ist stark, hat Macht, vermag,' *tūya-s* 'geschwind, stark,' *tavás*, *taviṣá-ṣ* 'stark,' *táviṣī* 'Kraft, Ungestüm,' etc. In related languages this base gives words for 'swell, be big,' etc. In some cases this may come from 'be strong,' in other cases from 'spring up, swell.'

From the primary meaning here assumed would naturally come such meanings as 'rush out; depart, cease; empty, etc.,' just as the base *dheu-* gives Gk. *θέω* 'run,' *θοός* 'quick,' *θύω* 'rush along, rage' and Skt. *dhvą́sati* 'zerstiebt, zerstreut,' *dhvasti-ṣ* 'Verschwinden;' ON. *deyia* 'die,' *duína* 'diminish, cease.' So a number of bases *teux-*, *tu̯ex-* show a similar change in meaning:—

ON. *þióta* 'rush or move rapidly on, spring (up); whiz, whistle, howl,' OHG. *diozan* 'rauschen, tosen; sich erheben, quellen, schwellen, zucken,' etc.—ON. *þysia*, *þyria* 'hervorstürzen' (: *þausn* 'Lärm,' OE. *þys* 'storm,' OHG. *dosōn* 'rauschen, tosen,' etc.): Av. *tusən* 'sie entleeren sich,' Bal. *tusag* 'ausgehen, erlöschen, verlassen werden,' OHG. *thwesben* 'auslöschen, vertilgen,' Skt. *tucchyá-s* 'leer, öde, nichtig,' ChSl. *tŭšti* 'leer,' *is-tŭštiti* 'evacuare,' *tušteta* 'damnum,' etc. (cf. *Color-Names* 34 f., 105, 117).—OHG. *dweran* 'drehen, rühren,' Skt. *tvárate* 'eilt,' Gk. *σαίρω* 'sweep, sweep away,' *σύρω* 'draw or trail along; sweep or wash down (of rivers); sweep away (of war); pass. flow or run down,' *σειρόω* 'empty,' ON. *þuerra* 'austrocknen, abnehmen,' OS. *thorron* 'vergehen,' *thior* 'trocken' (cf. *Mod. Lang. Notes* XXI, 42).

23. BŪGAN, BEUGAN

Biegen was no doubt originally an aorist-present, pre-Germ. **bhūqǵ*. Goth. *biugan*, OHG. *biogan*, etc., have restored the normal type. In ON. an inf. **biūga* is often assumed. So Kahle, *Aisl. Elementarbuch* § 370; Bethge in *Dieter's Altgermanische Dialekte* § 237, *Anm.* 3, etc. But aside from the Goth. and HG., the inf. represents Germ. *būgan*: OSw. *būgha*, OE. *būgan*, OFries. **būga* (NFries. *būz̄*), OS. *būgan*, MLG. *būgen*, EFries. *būgen*, MDu. *būghen*, etc. As the verb was an aorist-present, the *g* in the present is explained, and connection with OHG. *buhil* 'Hügel,' to which I have added Lith. *buklùs* 'listig, schlau' (*Mod. Lang. Notes* 19, 4 f.), is the best so far given.

24. BEULAN *or* BŪLAN

A Germ. st. verb **beulan* or **būlan* may perhaps be assumed from OSw. pp. *bolin*, *bulin* 'aufgeschwollen,' Sw. dial. *bulen*, Norw. dial. *bolen*, whence the wk. verbs: OSw. *bulna*, *bolna*, Sw. *bulna*, etc., 'aufschwellen.' Compare MDu. (Kilian) *buylen* 'extuberare,' EFries. *būlen* 'schwellen,' OE. *bȳle*, OHG. *pūlla*, MHG. *biule* 'Beule,' Goth. *ufbauljan* 'aufschwellen machen, hochmütig machen,' Ir. *bolach* 'Beule,' Skt. *bhūri-ṣ* 'reichlich, viel, gross, gewaltig,' and Skt. *bhūmá* 'Fülle, Menge,' *bhávati* 'gedeiht, entsteht, wird, ist,' etc.

Others make OSw. *bolin*, *bulin*, etc., identical with OSw. *bulghin*, etc., from Germ. *belgan* 'swell.' This explanation is doubted by Noreen, *Aschw. Gram.* 311, *Anm.* 1, who suggests, 535, *Anm.* 2, the possibility that *bolin*, *bulin* is a preterit participle of the fourth series from a base *bhel-* 'swell.'

25. BRŪKAN

OE. *brūcan* 'make use of, enjoy; eat; spend (life); possess, keep,' OFries. *brūka* 'brauchen,' OS. *brūkan* (only in inf.) 'geniessen' are st. verbs, beside which occur wk. verbs in Goth. *brūkjan*, etc. These have long been connected with Lat. *frūgēs* 'fruits,' *fruor* 'enjoy' (from **frūguor*), etc., and may be referred to a base *bhrūg̑-* 'break, enlarged from *bheru̯e-*, *bhreu-* 'break, consume, eat' (perhaps as a rime-word to *bhreg̑-* 'break') in Skt. *bhárvati*

'kaut, verzehrt,' Av. *baourvō* 'Speise,' ChSl. *brŭsnąti, brysati* 'abreiben,' OE. *brȳsan* 'bruise,' *brēotan* 'break,' etc., *ā-brēoþan* 'deteriorate; prove untrustworthy, fail; perish, come to end,' ON. *bryðia* 'zerbeissen,' OHG. *brōdi* 'zerbrechlich, schwach,' OE. *brēaþ* 'brittle,' to which belong OE. *brēad* 'morsel, crumb, bread,' OHG. *brōt*, etc. (cf. *Color-Names* 25).

The base *bhreuĝ-, bhrūĝ* 'break' may be in Lith. *brūžúju* 'scheuere mit Geräusch,' ON. *brauka* 'lärmen,' Gk. *φρύγω* 'roast, parch,' i. e. 'cause to crackle,' with which compare *bhreuq-* in Lett. *brukt* 'abbröckeln, sich abstreifen,' Lith. *braukiu* 'streiche, scharre etwas mit Anwendung einiges Druckes.'

For the meaning compare the following: OE. *brēotan* 'break,' *bryttian* 'tear to pieces, divide; distribute; possess, enjoy.'—Skt. *bhanákti* 'bricht': Skt. *bhájati, -tē* 'teilt, teilt zu; erhält als Teil, wird teilhaftig,' *bhákṣati* 'nimmt Teil an, geniesst, verzehrt,' Gk. *φαγεῖν* 'eat.'—Lith. *peszù* 'pflücke, reisse ab, raufe,' OHG. *fehōn* 'verzehren, essen,' *gifehan* 'sich freuen' (cf. IE. $a^x : a^xi : a^xu$ 46).—Gk. *τρίβω* 'rub, thresh, grind; bruise; wear out, spend, use.'—Gk. *τρητός* 'bored through,' Lith. *trõtyti* 'an Leib und Leben schädigen,' Slov. *tratiti* 'verwenden, verschwenden,' ChSl. *tratiti* 'verbrauchen' (cf. Hirt, *PBB.* XXIII, 293).

26. DREUGAN

Goth. *driugan* 'Kriegsdienste tun,' OE. *drēogan* 'do (with effort), perform, carry out, wage (war), commit (crime), lead (a certain life), enjoy; suffer, endure; be busy, strive,' EFries. *drēgen*, pret. *drōg* (and *drēgde*), pp. *dragen* (for earlier **drogen*) 'strecksam, austrägig, ausgiebig und verschlagsam sein, lange vorhalten und ausreichen, im Verbrauche sich lange hinziehen und ausdehnen': ON. *drýgia* wk. 'vollführen, ausführen, betreiben,' *driúgr, drýgr*, OSw. *drȳgher*, Sw. *dryg* 'lange oder weit reichend, gross, stark,' *drȳja* 'dauern, währen,' Dan. *drøie* 'Verschlag geben; verschlagen, hinreichen, vorhalten,' *drøi* 'derb, schwer, dick; langweilig,' Fries. *driech* 'aushaltend,' OE. *gedrēog* 'what is useful or suitable, keeping (shoes) in good order,' Pruss. *drūktai* 'fest,' Lith. *drūkṭas* 'fest, stark,' OE. *droht* 'manner of life,' *drohtian*, 'pass life, live, dwell, continue; behave,' Goth.

drauhti-witōþ, *drauhtinassus* 'Kriegsdienst,' *gadrauhts* 'Kriegsmann.' Cf. Schade, *Wb.* 961; J. ten Doornkaat Koolman, *Wb. der ostfries. Sprache* I, 329; Zupitza, *Gutturale* 129.

These go back to a base *dhreu-gh-* 'hold out, endure, continue; endure, bear, be strong, etc.,' with which compare Skt. *dharúṇa-s* 'haltend, stützend,' *dhruvá-s* 'feststehend, dauernd, beständig,' Av. *drva-* 'gesund,' etc., from *dher-* in Skt. *dhārāyati* 'hält, trägt, erträgt, etc.' (cf. IE. a^x*:* $a^x i$*:* $a^x u$ 78; Walde, *Et. Wb.* 239 with references).

ON. *drótt*, OE. *dryht*, OS. *druht-*, OHG. *truht* 'Gefolge, Schar' are probably not related to the above. They are certainly not identical with Goth. *drauhti-witoþ*. This is a verbal noun from *driugan*, and is closely related to OE. *droht* 'manner of life.' Germ. *druhti-* 'Gefolge,' on the other hand, is a denominative from OE. *gedrēag* 'crowd, troop, tumult, lamentation,' Gall. *drungos*, Ir. *drong* 'Schar,' Lith. *draũgas* 'Gefährte,' ChSl. *drugŭ* 'Genosse.'

These words are semantically different from Goth. *driugan*. For this means '(bellum) gerere' not 'militare.' Or if it does properly mean 'militare' then it cannot be directly connected with OE. *drēogan*, ON. *drýgia*, etc.; and these are certainly related to ON. *drúgr*, etc.

And yet OE. *drēogan* 'perform, carry out, wage, etc.,' and *dryht* 'troop' may be remotely related. For while the former comes from *dhereu-* 'hold, continue, etc.,' in Skt. *dharúṇa-s* 'haltend,' *dhruvá-s* 'dauernd, beständig,' the latter may come from the same base in the sense 'hold, press together.' Compare Gk. *ἀ-θρόοι* 'assembled in masses, crowded together,' *ἀθροίζω* 'gather together, collect, levy (troops),' Skt. *sa-dhrí* 'einem Ziele zu,' *dhārāyati* 'hält, hält fest, etc.' So OE. *gedrēag* 'crowd, troop' represents a pre-Germ. -**dhrougho-m* 'holding together, gathering, troop.'

27. FREUSAN

ON. *friósa* 'frieren' etc.:—Goth. *frius* 'Frost,' OE. *forst*, ON., OS., OHG. *frost*, etc., have been compared with Skt. *pruṣvá* 'Tropfen, gefrorenes Wasser, Reif,' Lat. *pruīna* 'hoar-frost,' *prūna* 'live coal,' *prūrio* 'itch,' i. e. 'burn,' Alb. *pruš* 'brennende

Kohlen, Glut,' Skt. *plóṣati* 'brennt, versengt' (cf. Walde, *Et. Wb.* 497 with references).

It is generally assumed that the base *preus-* meant both 'burn' and 'freeze,' and it would be easy to find parallels for such a double meaning. In that case the primary meaning would be 'sting' or the like. For 'burn' could not pass into 'freeze' nor 'freeze' into 'burn.'

But if Skt. *pruṣvá* is related to *freeze*, and it no doubt is, the primary meaning could hardly have been 'sting' and certainly not 'burn.' I therefore refer these words to the base *preus-* 'hervorströmen, spritzen, sprenkeln, sprühen: reifen, frieren; lodern, brennen.' That is, the primary meaning was 'spurt, emit' (water, breath, etc.), and from this came 'be frosty, freeze' and blaze, burn,' and then 'itch.' The development may be represented thus: sprühen < reifen, frieren / lodern, brennen: jucken.

Freeze, therefore, is closely related to Sw. *frusa* 'heftig hervorströmen,' *frusta*, ON. *frýsa*, *frúsa* 'schnauben,' Skt. *pruṣṇóti*, *-náti*, *pruṣyati* 'spritzt, sprenkelt, bespritzt,' ChSl. *prysnąti*, Russ. *prýsnuti*, *prýskati* 'spritzen,' etc.[1]

With Persson, *Studien* 163, I regard the base *preus-* in the above as an outgrowth of *preu-*, also in Skt. *próthati* 'schnaubt,' OE. *ā-frēopan* 'froth,' etc., which may be from *perē-*. *Perē-*, *perēs-* show the same development of meaning as *prēu-*, *prĕus-*: Russ. *pŕeti* 'schwitzen, sieden,' Gk. *πίμπρημι*, *πρήθω* ' blow up, fan into a blaze, kindle,' MHG. *vrademen*, *vredemen* 'dunsten, duften,' MSw. *frādha* 'Schaum;' ON. *forsa* 'strömen,' OSw. *frēsa* 'sprühen, sprudeln,' Czech *pršeti* 'sprühen, stieben, regnen,' LRuss. *poroša* 'frischer Schnee im Herbste.'

Parallel to Skt. *pruṣ-* '(be)spritzen' : Skt. *pruṣvá* 'Tropfen, gefrorenes Wasser, Reif,' Goth. *frius* 'Frost,' etc.; Skt. *plóṣati* 'brennt,' etc., are the following: MHG. *schrœjen* 'spritzen, stieben, triefen: sprühen, lodern,' *schrā-* 'Hagel, Reif, Schnee,' *schrāt* 'spritzendes Wasserteilchen.'—Lat. *spargo* 'scatter, sprinkle,' OE. *spiercan* 'sparkle; sputter,' *spiercing* 'sprinkling,'

[1] This is a combination which I first gave in *Color-Names and Their Congeners* (Max Niemeyer, Halle, 1902) 55. So far as I know, it has been adopted only by Falk og Torp I, 201. Walde has apparently never seen *Color-Names*.

Welsh *eira*, Ir. *arg* 'Schnee' (cf. Fick II⁴, 18).—ON. *hrata* 'stagger, fall, tumble,' NIcel. *hrat* 'refuse (of berries); droppings of birds,' *hret* 'cold weather with snow or rain.'—Skt. *dhūnóti* 'schüttelt,' *dhávati* 'rennt, läuft, rinnt, fliesst,' OHG. *tou* 'Tau,' Gk. τῦφος 'smoke,' MHG. *tuft* 'Dunst, Nebel, Tau, Reif,' OHG. *tuft* 'Frost.'—Skt. *hinóti*, *háyati* 'setzt in Bewegung, schleudert,' *himá-s* 'Kälte, Winter,' *himá-m* 'Schnee,' Lat. *hiems*, etc. (cf. Prellwitz, *Et. Wb.*² 503).

28. GEUWAN

ON. *gyggua* 'verzagen,' from **giggua*, **giuwan*, is found only in the present and in pp. *guggenn* 'verzagt,' NIcel. *gugginn* 'dispirited, downcast,' whence ON., NIcel. *gugna* 'lose heart, quail.' This verb properly belongs in the second series, not in the third as classed by Noreen, *Aisl. Gram.* § 420; Kahle, *Aisl. Elementarbuch* § 377; Bethge in *Dieter's Altgermanische Dialekte* § 238. It may be refered to a base *ĝheu-* 'give way, yield, become loose, slack; open, yawn, etc.' Compare Gk. χαος 'empty space,' χαῦνος 'slackened, loose, flabby,' χαῦλος· χαῦνος, LG. *gull* 'schlaff, mürbe,' EFries. *gul* 'lose, locker, mürbe, weich, etc.

29. HLEUTAN

ON. *hlióta* 'auf sein Los erhalten,' etc., are compared by Zupitza, *Gutturale* 119, with Lett. *kljūt* 'werden, gelingen,' *kljūtas* 'Schicksal,' Lith. *nekliūtas* 'Misgeschick,' to which Falk og Torp, *Etymologisk Ordbog* I, 465, add Lith. *kliuti* 'hängen bleiben,' *kliudýti* 'anhaken machen.' These, however, are better taken with Lat. *claudo* (cf. Walde, *Et. Wb.* 126 with references).

We shall do better, I think, if we return to the explanation given by Schrader, *KZ.* 30, 495. According to him Germ. *hlut* came from pre-Germ. **kl̥d-* and is to be compared with Gk. κλάδος 'branch.' From *hlut-* was formed by analogy the ablaut grades *hleut-*, *hlaut-*.

But instead of comparing the Germ. words directly with Gk κλάδος, we should rather derive them from a base *qlā-u̯o-*, *qlu-* an outgrowth of *qolā-* 'beat, break.' The simple base occurs in Lith. *kalù* 'schlage, schmiede,' ChSl. *klati*, Russ. *kolotĭ* 'stechen

kolóda 'Klotz, Block,' Gk. *κλάδος* 'branch,' *κλαστός* 'broken,' *κλῆρος* 'share, lot,' etc., to which add Skt. *kalā* 'kleiner Teil,' *kálpate* 'wird zu teil, wird geordnet,' *kalpáyati* 'teilt zu, verteilt, ordnet an.' The derived base *qlā-u̯o-*, *-u̯ā-*, *qlāu-* occurs in Lat. *clāva* 'a knotty branch, stick, cudgel' and in Goth. *hlauts* 'Los, Erbteil,' ON. *hlaut* 'Los, Anteil, Opfer,' etc., pre-Germ. *qlău-do* 'part, share, lot,' whence Germ. *hleutan* with secondary ablaut from *hlaut-*, *hlut-* (IE. $a^x : a^x i : a^x u$ 87).

In the meaning this explanation fits far better than that of Zupitza. The primary meaning of *lot* was 'share,' exactly as in Gk. *κλῆρος*. Compare Skt. *dyáti* 'schneidet ab, teilt, etc.,' *dāyá-s* 'Anteil, Erbteil,' etc.; OE. *scieran* 'cut, shear,' *scierian* 'allot, assign, grant,' NE. *share*.

30. HNŪKAN

NIcel, *hnokinn* 'bowed, stooping' is a strong participle belonging to the ON. weak verb *hnúka* 'kauern, gebückt sein.' It sustains the same relation to *hnúka* that NIcel., ON. *hokinn* 'gebückt' does to ON. *húka* 'kauern.' To *hnúka* are related ON. *hnauk* 'Drücken,' *hneykia* 'bezwingen, niederbrechen; erniedrigen, schänden,' MHG. *nucken*, *nücken* 'nicken, stutzen' (vom Pferde), *entnücken* 'einnicken, einschlafen,' MLG. *nuck* 'plötzlicher Stoss,' *nucken* 'seine Unzufriedenheit äussern durch Kopfschütteln,' *nugen* 'beugen,' NE. *nudge* 'leicht stossen,' OE. *hnygela* 'shred, clipping,' NIcel. *hnykkja* 'pull violently; clinch, rivet,' OGutn. *nykkia* 'zücken.'

These point to a Germ. base *hnūk-*, *hnukk-*, *hnŭg-*, probably pre-Germ. **qnŭgᵘh-* from *qneu-*, riming with **qneigᵘh-* in Goth. *hneiwan* 'sich neigen, sinken,' OE., OS. *hnīgan* 'sich neigen,' etc., MHG. *nicken* 'beugen, niederdrücken; sich neigen, nicken.'

Other bases *qneux-* occur with similar meanings: Lith. *knubu* 'bin gebückt,' *knúpoju* 'kniee,' ON. *hnúfa* 'Buckel, Höcker, Knoten,' NIcel. *hnypra sig saman* 'crouch, cower,' *hnypur* 'cowering posture;' NIcel. *hnjósa* 'stumble,' *hnjóta* 'stumble.' These are referable to a base *qneu-* 'press,' whence 'press or be pressed down, bend, cower, etc.,' in the above. We may therefore compare ON. *hnǫggua* 'thrust,' *hnuggenn* 'down-cast, sad,' OHG. *(h)niuwan* 'zerdrücken, zerstossen, zerreiben,' Gk. *κνύω* 'scratch, scrape.'

The double development 'press, squeeze, crush, rub, etc.,' and 'press, contract, bend; bow down, cower' is found in a number of words representing IE. bases *qnex-*, *qneix-*, *qneux-*:—Lith. *knebenù* 'Klaube,' *knabu* 'schäle ab,' ON. *hnóf* 'schnitt ab,' OE. *hnœppan* 'strike': ON. *hneppa* 'zusammenkneifen, einengen,' *hnefe* 'Faust;' OE. *hnappian* 'doze, sleep.'—Lett. *knẽbt* 'kneifen,' Lith. *knĩbu* 'klaube, zupfe,' *knybau* 'dränge, belästige,' MLG. *nīpen* 'kneifen,' ON. *hnippa* 'stossen, stechen,' *hnífr* 'Messer': ON. *hnípa* 'hang the head, look down, be sad,' *hnipra* 'crouch,' OE. *hnipian* 'droop; be dejected; doze,' Lith. *knimbu* 'knicke zusammen; falle auf die Knie.'—OSw. *niūpa* 'kneifen,' Goth. *dishniupan* 'zerreissen,' ON. *hnúfa* 'chop off,' EFries. *nubben* 'knuffen, stossen, schlagen': Lith. *knubu* 'bin gebückt,' *knúpoju* 'knie,' ON. *hnúfa* 'Buckel, Höcker, Knoten.'—ON. *hnauk* 'Drücken,' MLG. *nuck* 'plötzlicher Stoss,' NE. *nudge:* MLG. *nugen* 'beugen,' ON. *hnúka* 'kauern, gebückt sein.'—MHG. *nicken* 'beugen, niederdrücken: sich neigen, nicken,' OHG. *hnīgan* 'sich neigen.'—ON. *hnekkia* 'stossen, 'zurückstossen, zerstören: zurückweichen,' Gk. *κνώσσω* 'slumber.' —ON. *hnióða* 'stossen, hämmern'; OE. *hnossian* 'beat': NIcel. *hnjóta, hnjósa* 'stumble' (cf. IE. a^x: $a^x i$: $a^x u$ 85 f.).

31. HREUDAN

ON. pp. *hroðenn* 'überzogen, gefärbt,' OE. (*ge*)*hroden* 'loaded, filled; adorned':—OE. *hyrst* for **hryst*, OHG. *rust* 'Rüstung,' *rusten* 'zurüsten, schmücken.' These are commonly compared with ON. *hrióða* 'säubern, ein Schiff entladen' (cf. Kluge, *Et. Wb.* s. v. rüsten; Zupitza, *Gutturale* 123; Falk og Torp II, 127).

But ON. *hroðenn*, OE. (*ge*)*hroden* come from an entirely different meaning from ON. *hrióða*, etc. (cf. no. 32). In the latter word 'säubern' comes from 'strip, clear away, etc.,' in the former 'adorn' comes from 'overlay, cover.' We may therefore compare Lith. *kráustau* 'lade, packe,' *kráudinu* 'lasse laden oder packen,' *kráuju* 'setze oder lege aufeinander, packe, lade,' *krūvà* 'ein Haufen übereinanderliegender Dinge,' *krũvyju* 'häufe,' ChSl. *kryti* 'decken,' *pokrovŭ* 'Decke, Dach,' Boh. *kryt* 'Dach,' and also Gk. *κόρυς*, acc. *κόρυθα*, *κόρυν* 'helmet,' *κορύσσω* 'equip, arm, rüsten,'

κορυστός 'heaped up,' κρύπτω 'conceal,' ON. *hrūga*, *hraukr* 'heap,' OE. *hrēac* 'heap, hayrick,' Ir. *cruach* 'Kornhaufe,' etc.

Though I separate ON. *hroðenn*, etc., from ON. *hrióða*, etc. (no. 32), yet they may be remotely related as derivatives of a common base *qreu-* 'shake, scatter, strew,' whence 'be scattered, fall, etc.,' and 'spread out, overlay, pile up, load, etc.' For parallel examples see *Color-Names* 70 f.

32. HREUÞAN

ON. *hrióða* 'strip, disable; unload, clear away; belch, vomit forth (steam, fire, expectoration),' NIcel. *hrjóða* 'strip, disable (a ship in a seafight)' may well be compared with Lith. *krutù* 'rühre mich, rege mich,' *krùtinu* 'rühre an,' *krutùs* 'rührig, beweglich,' ON. *hraustr* 'rüstig, tapfer, gesund' (cf. Zupitza, *Gutturale* 123), to which add Norw. dial. *rjoda* 'udsprede, udkaste, drysse, styrte ud,' ON. *hroðe* 'refuse, offal,' *hryða* 'excretion,' *hryðia* 'rough weather, sleet, tempest,' OE. *hryþig* 'in ruins,' *hrēaþe-mūs* 'Fledermaus,' MHG. *rütten* 'zerrütten,' *rütteln*, *rutschen*, base *qreut-* 'shake, scatter, fall, etc.,' from *qreu-* in Pruss. *krūt* 'fallen' (cf. author, IF. XVIII, 18; Falk og Torp II, 127).

33. KIUWAN

OE. *cēowan* 'chew; gnaw; eat, consume,' OHG. *kiuwan*, etc., go back to pre-Germ. **ĝ̑iuo-*: ChSl. *živati* 'kauen' from *gi̯uu̯o-* (cf. Brugmann, *Kurze vergleichende Grammatik* 96), Lith. *žiaunė* 'Bissen, Brot.' These are perhaps derived from *ĝ̑ĭ-* in Skt. *jināti* 'raubt, beraubt, bedrückt,' Av. *zināṭ*, OPers. *a-dinā* 'nahm weg,' Bal. *zinaγ* 'an sich reissen, hastig ergreifen,' whence a derived base in ON. *kippa* 'ruckweise ziehen, haschen, schnappen,' MHG. *kifen*, *kiffen*, *kifelen* 'nagen, kauen,' *kivel*, *kiver* 'Kiefer, Kinnbacken' (cf. *Color-Names* 53 f. with references).

34. REUKAN, RŪKAN

ON. *riūka* 'rauchen, dampfen; stieben, jagen; stürzen, fallen,' etc., OHG. *riohhau* 'rauchen, dampfen, duften, riechen, Geruch empfinden' were long ago compared with Gk. ἐρεύγομαι 'belch, emit,' etc. (cf. Schade, *Wb.* 719). This connection I also gave,

Journal of Germ. Philology II, 226 f., supposing at that time that the explanation was original with me, and later in the *Publications of the Mod. Lang. Assoc.* XIV, 308 f.

The same combination is adopted by Lewy, *PBB.* 32, 146, who, however, assumes that the primary meaning of *riechen* is 'stechen.' Now there are many examples of that change in meaning, but *riechen* is not one of them. Here the primary meaning was 'break forth, belch,' whence 'smoke, exhale, etc.,' and then 'smell, reek' (of good or bad odors), and finally transitive 'smell, riechen.' Compare Gk. *ἐρεύγομαι* 'burst forth, belch, bellow,' etc., and especially Lat. *ē-ructo* 'belch forth, emit, exhale' (e. g. *flammas*, *vaporem*, *fumum*, Just. 4, 1, 4), *ē-ructātio* 'exhalation.' These leave no doubt as to the primary meaning of *riechen*.

Like *riechen* are the following: Skt. *dhūnóti* 'schüttelt,' *dhūmá-s* 'Rauch, Dampf,' OHG. *toum* 'Dampf, Dunst, Duft, Geruch,' Goth. *dauns* 'Dunst, Geruch,' MHG. *tuft* 'Dunst, Nebel, Tau, Reif,' NHG. *Duft*, to Gk. *τῦφος* 'smoke' or Skt. *dhūpa-s* 'Räucherwerk.'—Skt. *kūpyati* 'wird erschüttert, wallt auf, zürnt,' ChSl. *kypěti* 'sieden, wallen,' Lett. *kūpēt* 'rauchen,' Lith *kvãpas* 'Hauch, Atem, Duft,' *kvepěti* 'duften,' *kvìpti* 'Geruch bekommen: duftend werden, auch stinkend werden.'—Skt. *vāti*, *vayati* 'weht,' OHG. *wāen* 'wehen,' MHG. *wāz* 'Wehen, Sturm; Atem, Hauch; Duft,' *wāzen* 'duften, riechen.'—Skt. *ániti* 'atmet,' ChSl. *vonjati* 'riechen, duften.'—Gk. *πνέω* 'blow, breathe, emit odor, smell,' *πνοή* 'wind, blast, exhalation, odor, fragrance.'—Skt. *bhuráti* 'bewegt sich, zuckt, bebt,' ON. *bráðr* 'sudden, hasty,' OE. *brǣþ* 'vapor, exhalation, odor.'—Skt. *taralá-s* 'zuckend, zitternd, unstät,' Ir. *tara* 'tätig, lebhaft,' OHG. *drāen* 'drehen; werbiln': *drāhen*, MHG. *drœhen*, *drœjen* 'hauchen, duften; Geruch empfinden, riechen,' *drās* 'Duft, Geruch,' *drāsen*, *drasen* 'duften; schnauben,' OE. *þrosm* 'vapor, smoke.'—Goth. *stigqan* 'stossen,' ON. *støkkua* 'springen, fort-, entspringen; stürzen, herabfallen; bespritzen,' OSw. *stiunka* 'springen, stieben,' OE. *stincan* 'rise (of dust); emit vapor; emit odor (good or bad),' OHG. *stinkan* 'duften, riechen; tr. riechen, wittern,' etc. Here the primary meaning is 'springen, stieben, duften, riechen,' and Goth. *stigqan* 'stossen' is the transitive use of the same verb.—ChSl. *gorěti*

'brennen,' Lith. *gãras* 'Dampf,' *garúti* 'dampfen,' *nu-garúti* '(von Speisen) abdampfen, den Geruch verfliegen lassen,' Skt. *jighrati, ghrāti* 'riecht,' etc. (cf. *Publications of the Mod. Lang. Assoc.* XIV, 308).—So many others.

35. STRŪDAN

OE. *strūdan* 'plunder, carry off; ravage, destroy' is probably an aorist-present, pre-Germ. **strūtó-*. Related are OE. *strȳdan* 'rob, deprive,' MLG. *stroden* 'rauben, plündern,' OHG. *struten* 'mit Gewalt wegnehmen, rauben,' etc. These are probably from *stereu-, streu-* in Gk. *στερέω* 'strip, rob, bereave,' Serv. *strv* 'Reste eines vom Wolfe gefressenen Viehes,' ChSl. *strŭvo* 'Aas' (cf. Prellwitz, *Et. Wb.*[2] 433), Lith. *strovyju* 'verzehre, esse,' *strovà* 'Speise,' OHG. *striunen* 'gewinnen, erwerben,' OE. *strīenan* 'acquire; beget,' *gestrēon* 'gain, profit, property; usury; procreation,' OS. *gistriuni* 'Schatz,' OHG. *kistriuni* 'lucrum.' For meaning compare ChSl. *loviti* 'jagen, fangen,' Gk. *λεία* 'booty,' *λῄζομαι* 'plunder, seize as booty,' Lat. *lucrum*, etc. (cf. *Color-Names* 81).

Other synonymous bases *streux-* occur: MHG. *striefen* 'streifen' st. verb, OHG. *stroufen* '(ab)streifen, schinden; intr. streichen, ziehen,' OE. *bestrīepan* 'strip off, plunder,' etc.—ON. *strúka* '(be)streichen, über etwas hin streichen,' ChSl. *strugati* 'kratzen, schnitzen, quälen,' Gk. *στρεύγομαι* 'be worn out,' etc.

36. TIUWAN

ON. *tyggua* 'kauen' belongs also to the second series (cf. no. 28). Beside strong forms in NIcel. and possibly OSw. occur OSw. *tugga, togga* 'kauen,' etc., and the related nouns OSw. *tagger* 'Zahn,' Norw. *tegg, tigg* 'Stachel.' According to Streitberg, *IF.* I, 514, the *t-* in ON. *tyggua* is palatalized from *kį̄-:* OE. *cēowan* 'chew.' Brugmann, *Grdr.* I[2], 285, 853, also combines OE. *cēowan* and ON. *tyggua*, regarding the latter as dissimilated from **kyggua.* I should explain *tyggua* rather as a rime-word to OE. *cēowan.* The latter represents Germ. **kiuwan, *kiwan:* ChSl. *živati* 'kauen' etc. (cf. no. 33) the former Germ. **tiuwan, *tiwan,* pre-Germ. **dĭ-uo-* (or *dĕ̆-uo-*) from *dē-i-* in Skt. *dāti, dyáti* 'schneidet ab, mäht, trennt, teilt,' *dāpayati* 'teilt,' Gk. *δάπτω* 'tear,'

Lat. *daps* 'meal,' OHG. *zālēn* 'wegreissen, rauben,' Skt. *dāyá-s* 'Anteil,' δαίομαι 'distribute,' δαίνῡμι 'distribute, give to eat; pass. feast, eat,' ON. *tína* 'abrupfen, ablesen,' etc.

37. ÞEUDJAN

Dan. *tyde* (st. and wk.) 'ausdeuten, erklären; deuten,' an originally weak verb, corresponding to Sw. *tyda*, OSw. *þyþa*, ON. *þýða* 'ausdeuten, bedeuten,' OHG. *diuten* 'verständlich machen, deuten, erklären; zeigen; anzeigen, erzählen; bedeuten,' etc., related to OHG. *diuta* 'Deutung, Erklärung,' *githiuti* 'Deuten, Hindeuten; Deutung, Ausdeutung,' *githiuti* 'aufmerkend, verstehend,' MHG. *ungediute* 'unachtsam,' etc.

These words are usually regarded as related to Goth. *þiuda* 'Volk,' OHG. *diota*, *diutisc*, etc.; and there is no doubt that they were felt to be related and that this feeling had its effect upon the meaning of *deuten*. For *deuten* would often be equivalent to *verdeutschen*.

But many of the meanings of *deuten* and its nearest cognates cannot be explained on the supposition that *deuten* meant 'volksmässig machen.' Notice especially OHG. *githiuti* 'aufmerkend,' MHG. *ungediute* 'unachtsam,' OHG. *githiuti* 'Hindeuten: Ausdeutung.' These meanings point rather to connection with Lat. *tūtus* 'watchful, careful, cautious; safe, secure,' *tueor* 'look at, watch; guard, care for, protect,' base *teu̯e-* also in Gk. σάος, σόος 'safe, sound, sure,' ψυχο-σσόος 'saving the life,' σώζω 'save, keep,' etc., and perhaps in Goth. *þius* 'Knecht,' i. e. 'servus, Bewahrer.' This explanation does not affect the connection of Lat. *tūtus* with Goth. *þiuþ* 'das Gute.'

38. GLINTAN

Norw. dial. *gletta*, Sw. dial. *glinta* 'gleiten,' MHG. *glinzen* 'glänzen, schimmern':—Norw. dial. *glanta*, Sw. dial. *glända*, 'gleiten,' *glant* 'glatt,' MHG., OHG. *glanz* 'glänzend, hell,' *glenzen* 'glänzen,' MHG. *glanz* 'Glanz,' ME. *glenten* 'shine, gleam, glance, look; glance off; tr. cast, throw,' NE. *glint* 'shine, gleam, glance,' Norw. dial. *gletta* 'gucken,' Sw. *glända* 'ein wenig öffnen,' dial. 'hervorleuchten,' etc., base *ghle(n)d-* 'slip, glide, open; be smooth, shiny, shine; glance, look, etc.': ChSl. *ględati*, Serv. *gledati*

'blicken, schauen,' Ir. *glése* 'Glanz' (**ghlend-tiā*) *at-gleinn* 'demonstrat,' OE. *glaterian* 'glitter.' Variously discussed by Schade, *Wb.* 336; Persson, *Studien* 172; Fick II⁴, 120; Zupitza, *Gutturale* 174; Falk og Torp, *Et. Ordbog* I, 233, 234 f.

39. HREHTAN

OE. **hreohtan* is found only in the pret. plur. *hruhtun* 'iniecerunt,' Mat. 26, 50. This probably represents a pre-Germ. **qreq-to-* from the base *qoreg-* 'drive, thrust, beat; vex, worry' in ON. *hrekia* 'drive, knock or toss about; worry, vex,' OFries. *hreka* 'reissen,' Ir. *crecht* 'Wunde,' Skt. *kárjati* 'quält' (cf. Fick II⁴, 97; Zupitza, *Gutturale* 125; Uhlenbeck, *Ai. Wb.* 46; Hirt, *Ablaut* 574).

40. HRINDAN

ON. *hrinda* 'stossen,' NIcel. *hrinda* 'thrust, push; cast off; throw out,' OSw. *rinda* 'stossen, aus dem Wege schaffen,' OE. *hrindan* 'thrust' are compared by Zupitza, *Gutturale* 123, with Lith. *krecžiu* 'schüttele,' *kretù* 'wackle,' *kratùs* (vom Pferde) 'hart trabend, daher den Reiter stauchend' (Kurschat), 'stossend, hart trabend' (Zupitza), *kratýti*, Lett. *kratināt* 'schütteln,' Ir. *crothim* 'schüttele,' ON. *hraðr* 'schnell,' OE. *hræd* 'quick, swift,' *hradian* 'hasten,' etc.

Without excluding the above I call attention to the following, which are more closely related in meaning: Gk. *κρότος* 'any striking or sound produced by striking,' *κροτέω* 'knock, strike; clap, applaud; hammer or weld together; rattle, clatter,' Skt. *krntáti*, *kártati* 'schneidet, spaltet, haut ab,' Av. *kərəntaiti* 'cut,' Lith. *kertù* 'schlage heftig, haue scharf,' *krintù* 'falle,' etc., base *qeret-* 'shake, thrust, cut, etc.' (cf. 1E. $a^x : a^xi : a^xu$ 88).

41. MELDEN

EFries. *melden* (*muld*, *mulden*) 'melden,' originally weak:—MLG., MDu. *melden* 'melden, verraten,' OS. *meldon*, OHG. *meldōn*, OE. *meldian*, denominative to OE. *meld* 'proclamation,' OHG. *melda* 'Verratung, Angeberei, Verleumdung,' etc., pre-Germ. **mel-tā-* 'treachery, deceit' from *mel-* in Lith. *mẽlas*

'Lüge,' *mìlyti* 'verfehlen,' Lett. *maldīt* 'irren, sich versehen,' *muldēt* 'herumirren,' *melst* 'verwirrt reden,' Ir. *mellaim* 'betrüge,' *mell* 'Sünde, Fehler,' etc. (cf. *Color-Names* 88).

42. MERKAN *or* MURKAN

ON. pp. *morkenn*, NIcel. *morkinn* 'decayed, rotten' (of meat and fish), Norw. *morken*, Sw. *murken* 'morsch, faul':—ON., NIcel. *morkna* 'become rotten,' Sw. *murkna* 'morsch werden, faulen,' MHG. *murc* 'morsch, faul, morastig,' MLG. *morken* 'zerdrücken,' OE. *murc* 'grievous' (hunger), *murcian*, *murcnian* 'grieve; complain,' base *mereg-* 'press, crush, wear away, etc.,' in Ir. *merc*, *merg* 'Runzel,' Welsh, *merydd* 'debilitas; debilis, flaccidus,' etc., with which compare *mereq-* in Skt. *marcáyati* 'gefährdet, versehrt, beschädigt,' *markā-s* 'Hinsterben, Tod,' Av. *mərəncaiti* 'versehrt, zerstört,' Lith. *miřkti* 'eingeweicht sein,' *markýti* 'den Flachs weichen,' LRuss. *morokva* 'Morast,' Ir. *brén*, Welsh *braen* (**mrakno-*) 'morsch, faul,' *brag*, Ir. *mraich*, *braich* 'Malz,' Corn. *moreth*, Bret. *morchet* 'Kummer, Sorge' (compare OE. *morcian* 'grieve'), Lat. *marceo* 'wither, droop, shrink,' *marcidus* 'withered, wasted, shrunk, decayed, rotten; feeble, languid; faint, pale, dull' (sun), ChSl. *mrakŭ* 'Finsternis,' *mrŭknati* 'dunkel werden,' etc. (similarly ON. *morkna*: *myrkr*, OE. *mirce*, OS. *mirki* 'finster,' etc.).

These are from a base *merā*^{x}- in Skt. *mṛṇáti* 'zermalmt, reibt auf' (*máratē* 'stirbt,' etc.), Gk. *μαραίνω* 'weaken, wear out,' ON. *meria* 'crush,' *morna* 'wither, rot,' OHG. *marawi* 'mürbe,' Ir. *meirb* 'weich,' MHG. *zermürsen* 'zerdrücken,' NHG. *morsch*, OE. *ā-mierran* 'disable, injure, corrupt, destroy; hinder,' Goth. *marzjan* 'ärgern,' Skt. *mṛ́ṣyatē* ('wird weich, lässt nach'), 'vernachlässigt, vergisst, duldet, verzeiht,' etc. (cf. *MLN.* XXI, 40 f.) and many other derived bases. On the above group of words cf. Persson, *Studien* 9, 65, 85, 145, 180; Uhlenbeck, *Ai. Wb.* 217; author, *Color-Names* 106; Falk og Torp I, 523 f.; Walde, *Et. Wb.* 367 f. with references.

43. MURNAN

OE. *murnan* 'be sad, anxious; care; tr. lament; care for, regard,' pret. *mearn*, *murnon* (also weak *murnde*, *-don*, NE.

mourn weak):—ON. *morna* 'grieve, mourn,' Goth. *maurnan* 'sorgen, ängstlich besorgt sein,' OS. *mornian*, *mornon*, OHG. *mornēn* 'sich kümmern.' These are usually compared with Lat. *memor* 'mindful, remembering,' Gk. *μέριμνα*, *μέρμηρα* 'care, anxious thought,' Skt. *smàrati* 'erinnert sich, gedenkt,' Av. *maraiti*, *-šmaraiti* 'gedenkt.' Cf. Schade, *Wb.* 621; Fick II⁴, 201; Prellwitz, *Et. Wb.*² 290; Uhlenbeck, *Et. Wb.*² 108, *Ai. Wb.* 352; Walde, *Et. Wb.* 377.

But in view of Lat. *marceo* 'wither, droop': Bret. *morchet* 'Kummer, Sorge,' ON. *morkna* 'rot': OE. *murcnian* 'grieve; complain;' we may compare OE. *murnau* 'mourn,' etc., with Skt. *mṛṇáti* 'zermalmt, zerschlägt,' Gk. *μαραίνω* 'weaken, wear out,' pass. 'languish,' *μαρασμός* 'withering, decay,' ON. *morna* 'wither, rot,' *meria* 'crush, bruise,' Norw. dial *moren* 'morsch,' etc. (cf. IE. a^x: $a^x i$: $a^x u$ 35). Compare Gk. *θρύπτω* 'break in pieces, crush; enfeeble, weaken,' Lett. *drupt* 'zerfallen,' *dráupīt* 'zerbröckeln': OS. *drūbon* 'niedergeschlagen, betrübt sein' (cf. *MLN.* XX, 42).

44. SERDAN

ON. *serða* 'Unzucht treiben,' OSw. pret. *sarþ* 'stupravit,' (OE. pret. sing. *serþ* probably weak), MLG. *serden* 'schänden, schädigen, quälen, betrügen,' *vorserden* 'beschädigen, verderben, ruinieren,' MHG. *serten* 'stuprare; quälen, plagen, belästigen; schlagen, hauen, locken, verführen, täuschen, betrügen,' *zerserten* 'zerhauen, -schneiden, -schlagen, verderben; intr. Scharten bekommen, verderben':—MHG. *erserten* wk. 'in Angst, ausser Fassung bringen,' base *ser-to*, perhaps in Welsh *serth* 'obscoenus,' *serthedd* 'obscoenitas, obscoena locutio' (cf. Fick II⁴, 301).

Connection of the above with Lat. *sero* 'join,' *consors*, etc. (cf. Meringer, *IF.* XVI, 171; Walde, *Et. Wb.* 565 f.), is improbable. Such meanings as 'hew, strike, cut (with a weapon); torment, annoy; deceive (men as well as women), etc.,' could hardly come from 'join.' The meanings in Germ. point rather to the base *ser-* in Skt. *sísarti*, *sárati* 'rennt, eilt, fliesst,' etc. Compare especially Skt. *adhi-sar-* 'herbeieilen, hinzutreten, losgehen auf, jemand einen Liebesbesuch machen,' Gk. *ὁρμή* 'any violent pressure onward, assault, attack; eagerness, violence, passion or appetite,'

ὁρμάω 'set in motion, urge, spur; tear (τινὰ ἐκ χερός); rush, hurry, be eager.' These meanings accord very well with those of Germ. *serdan* 'attack, assault; beat, strike; annoy, worry; violate, etc.'

45. SCHENKEN

NWFries. *skinkə* 'schenken,' EFries. *schenken* (*schunk*, *schunken*), MDu. *scenken*, (st. and wk.), Du. *schenken*, etc., originally weak, Germ. **skankjan* in OE. *scencan*, OFries. *skenka*, OHG. *scenken*, MLG. *schenken* (whence ON. *skenkia*), etc., to which belong OE. *scenc* 'cup, draught,' OS. *skenkio*, OHG. *scenko* 'Diener zum Einschenken, Schenk,' MHG. *schank*, *schenk*(*e*) 'Geschenk,' etc. These are usually derived from OE. *scanca* 'shank,' MHG. *schinke*, *schenkel*, etc. For a review of the theories of those who make this connection see Schilling, *Jour. of Germ. Phil.* IV, 510 ff.

In spite of the good case made out by Schilling, we may refer *schenken* to the primary meaning 'turn, overturn,' whence 'pour out, etc.,' and compare ON. *skekkia* (**skankjan*) 'schief machen,' *skakkr* 'hinkend, schief,' Dan. *skank* 'lahm,' Sw. dial. *skink* 'lahm,' *skinka*, *skånka*, *skunka* 'hinken,' Gk. *σκάζω* 'limp' (cf. *IF.* XVIII, 27).

For meaning compare the following: Sw. *stup* 'schief,' *stupa* 'abstürzen; stürzen, fallen,' OE. *stūpian* 'stoop, curve downward,' ON. *steypa* 'stürzen, umstürzen, zu Fall bringen: giessen,' OSw. *støpa*, Sw. *stöpa*, Dan. *støbe* 'giessen.'—OSw. *stiœlpa* st. 'umfallen,' wk. 'umwälzen,' ON. *stelpa*, MLG. *stulpen* 'umstürzen,' EFries. *stülpen* 'stülpen, stürzen, schütten, giessen.' Here belongs NHG. *stolpern* (cf. J. ten Doornkaat Koolman, *Wb. d. ostfries. Sprache* III, 352; Falk og Torp II, 302).—OE. *steartlian* 'stumble,' MLG. *storten* 'stürzen, fallen; umstürzen; ausschütten, in Fülle ein-, oder vergiessen,' MHG. *sturzen*, *stürzen* 'umsinken, fallen; umwenden, giessen.'—OHG. *sīgan* 'sich vorwärts bewegen, sich niederwärts bewegen, sich senken, sinken, tropfend fallen,' Skt. *siñcáti* 'giesst, begiesst.'

46. STECKEN

EFries. *steken*, *stäken*, pret. *stak*, *stakken*, *stōk*, *stoken* (and *stēk*, *steken*), pp. *stoken*, *staken* 'stecken, verbergen' (confused

with *steken* 'stechen'), *fersteken, -stäken*, pret. *ferstōk(en)*, pp. *ferstaken* 'verstecken, wegstecken, verbergen, umstecken,' NHG. *stecken*, pret. *stak, stack*, pp. *gestocken*, early NHG. pres. *stickestu* (Luther), pret. *bestack* (Sachs), *stack* (Dietenberger), *stack(e)*, *stacken*, pp. *gestocken* (Grimmelshausen):—MHG. *stecken* wk. 'festsitzen, festhaften; festheften, befestigen,' *bestecken* 'stecken bleiben; bestecken, festsetzen,' etc., OHG. *stecko* 'Stecken, Stock,' OE. *staca*, ON. *stake* 'stake,' *staka* 'impale, stechen,' etc., EFries. *stak* 'gerade, gerade auf, -aus,' *staken* 'stehend oder stillstehend machen, zum Stehen oder Halten bringen, Einhalt tun, hemmen, festsetzen': Skt. *sthágati, sthagayati* 'hemmt, verschliesst, verbirgt, verhüllt,' Gk. στέγω 'keep off, hold off; hold in check (tears), hold in, contain, cover over, shelter, protect,' Lith. *stẽgiu* 'decke,' *stógas* 'Dach,' ChSl. *o-stegŭ* 'Kleid,' *stogŭ* 'Heuschober,' ON. *stakkr* 'Schober,' NE. *stack*, etc., base *stheg-* 'stand, cause to stand, check, hold, stop, close, cover, etc.' The base *stheg-* is confused with *teg-* 'cover,' which is probably otherwise unrelated (cf. *MLN.* XX, 44; *IE.* a^x: a^xi: a^xu 130).

47. SWINGWAN

OE. *swingan* 'swing: beat, flap (wings); beat, strike, afflict; whip,' etc., because of Goth. *afswaggwjan* 'schwankend machen,' point to a pre-Germ. *su̯enqᵘ-* in Skt. *sváñc(as)* 'sich leicht wendend, gewandt' (cf. author, *MLN.* XVI, 24) and, without the nasal, in Norw. dial. *svaga* 'schwanken,' ChSl. *sukati* 'drehen, spinnen,' Lith. *sùkti* 'drehen,' *sukrùs* 'agil, beweglich, schnell, flink,' etc. (cf. Schade, *Wb.* 916 f. with references, and others).

From 'swing' develop several secondary meanings. 'Swinging, swaying' implies 'giving way, sinking,' hence words for 'thin, slender' or 'subside, disappear, etc.' Here belong ON. *suangr* 'dünn, schlank, ausgehungert, ermattet' and Lett. *sukt* 'schwinden, entwischen,' OE. *geswōgen* 'in a swoon; dead; silenced,' *āswōgan* 'suffocate,' ON. *sóa* 'feierlich, töten' (**swōhan*, cf. *MLN.* XVIII, 16). The synonymous base *su̯eng-, seu̯eg-* shows the same change in meaning: Skt. *svájate* 'umschlingt, umarmt,' *svajá-s* 'Art Schlange,' MHG. *swinken* 'schwingen,' *swanken* 'schwanken, taumeln, nicht von statten gehen, etc.,' *swanc*

'schwankend: stürmisch; schlank, dünn, schmächtig,' LG. *swinken* 'abnehmen,' OE. *swancor* 'pliant, supple; agile, graceful; weak,' MLG. *swak* 'biegsam, dünn, gering, schwach, kraftlos, zerbrechlich,' MHG. *swach* 'schwach, etc.,' Goth. *siuks* 'schwach, siech,' Skt. *skúṣma-s* 'fein, schmal, dünn, klein' (cf. *MLN.* XVI, 24; *Color-Names* 30 f., 33 f., where many other examples of a similar change in meaning are given).

Closely related in meaning with these are Lith. *sunkùs* 'schwer,' *suñkinu* 'beschwere, belästige,' OE. *swangor* 'sluggish,' OHG. *swangar* 'gravida, schwanger.' These words were formerly connected with *schwingen* (cf. Schade, *Wb.* 902; Franck, *Wb.* 1227), but now are often separated (cf. Zupitza, *Gutturale* 139, and others).

The meaning 'heavy' comes from 'sway, give way, sink.' Compare the following: Lith. *svirus* 'schwebend, schwankend,' *sveriù* 'wäge,' *svarùs* 'schwer,' OE. *swær* 'heavy; grievous, sad; sluggish; weak.'—OHG. *wegan* 'sich bewegen; bewegen, wägen,' MHG. *gewiht* 'Gewicht.'—Lat. *pendēre* 'dangle, hang down; be flaccid, weak,' *pendere* 'weigh,' *pondus* 'weight, heaviness.'

48. TELDAN

OE. *beteldan* 'cover, surround, overwhelm (with grief)':—OE. (*ge*)*teld* 'tent,' *teldian* 'spread (tent),' OHG. *zelt* 'Zelt,' etc., *zelto* 'Art Fladen, flaches Backwerk' are from a base *del-to-*, which is best referred to *delā-* 'stretch, extend, spread out' in Lith. *délna*, ChSl. *dlanĭ* 'flache Hand,' Gk. δόλων 'small sail' (cf. Walde, *Et. Wb.* 182). To the same base probably belong Lith. *delsiù* 'säume, zögere' and ChSl. *dlŭgŭ*, Skt. *dīrghá-s*, Gk. δολιχός 'lang,' ἐνδελεχής 'fortdauernd,' Lat. *indulgeo*, Goth. *tulgus* 'ausdauernd,' etc.

49. TREKKEN

MDu. *trecken* tr., intr. 'ziehen,' usually weak but also forms pret. plur. *trocken*, pp. *getrocken*, Du. *trekken* 'draw, pull, drag, pluck, etc.,' MLG. *trecken* (usually weak) tr. 'ziehen, führen, schleppen; hinziehen, hinzögern; intr. ziehen, sich wohin begeben,' EFries. *trekken* 'ziehen, schleppen, reissen,' all originally weak verbs corresponding to OFries. *trekka*, *tregga*, MHG. *trecken*

'ziehen,' related to *trechen* intr. 'ziehen; tr. ziehen, schieben, stossen,' MDu. *treken*, etc. For possible cognates outside of Germ. see Schade, *Wb.* 952; Franck, *Et. Wb.* 1029 f. These point to a base *dreg-*, *dregh-*, *deregh-* 'draw, pull, tear, etc.,' with which compare MLG. *trāch* 'träge, langsam,' i. e. 'zögernd,' OHG. *trāgi* 'träge, langsam, verdrossen,' Goth. *trigō* 'Widerwille, Trauer,' ON. *tregr* 'unwillig,' etc. All of these meanings can come from 'reissen, zerren, ziehen.' Compare the following:

MLG. *tergen* 'zerren, reizen, necken,' OE. *tiergan* 'irritate, annoy, afflict,' NE. *tarry* 'zögern, zaudern; verziehen, verweilen.' —Goth. *tahjan* 'reissen, zerren,' OHG. *zag* 'zurückhaltend, unentschlossen,' *zagēn* 'verzagt sein.'—MLG. *tappen*, *teppen* 'zupfen,' ON. *tefia*, *teppa* '(ver)hindern.'—MDu. *toven* 'zupfen,' MLG. *tobben* 'zupfen, locken, zwacken, zerren, etc.,' *toven*, *tuven* 'auf-, anhalten; hindern, festhalten; warten, zaudern.'—OHG. *zogōn* 'zerren, ziehen, reissen, raufen; hinhalten, verzögern,' MLG. *togeren* 'zögern, verziehen; hinhalten, verschieben, warten lassen, etc.'—ON. *tióðr* 'tether,' MLG. *tuder* 'Weideseil,' EFries. *todden* 'ziehen, schleppen, tragen,' MHG. *zoten* 'langsam gehen,' NHG. *zaudern*, OE. *tīedre* 'weak, frail; not lasting, fleeting,' EFries. *tēder* 'schwach, zart, dünn' (cf. *MLN.* XVI, 16 ff.; IE. a^x: $a^x i$: $a^x u$ 71).—NE. *drag* 'draw, pull, haul; intr. be drawn along, trail; move or proceed heavily, laboriously, or slowly, move on languidly or with effort.'—Lat. *traho* 'draw, drag, etc.; draw out, protract, delay, retard.'—Gk. ἕλκω 'draw, drag, etc.,' ὁλκός 'drawing, dragging: attractive; greedy; slow.'

50. PERSAN

Goth. *gaþairsan* 'verdorren':—ON. *þerra* from **þarzjan* 'abtrocknen, abwischen,' etc., contain a widespread IE. base *ters-*, the most common meaning of which is 'dry.' But it does not follow from this that 'dry' is the original meaning. It will be noticed that most IE. bases *terex-* mean primarily 'rub, press.' It is therefore possible that *ters-* had originally such a meaning. If so, we may add to the words usually compared Lith. *tersiù* 'schmutze, mache schmutzig,' *tir̃sztas* 'dickflüssig,' with which compare especially Skt. *tṛṣṭá-s* 'rauh, holprig, heiser.'

We have then the following development in meaning 'rub': (1) 'smear, etc.;' (2) 'make rough, dry, etc.' For the first meaning compare the following: Lith. *trinu* 'reibe,' *tráimiotis* 'sich umherstossen; beschmutzen.'—Base *treip-* 'press, rub': Lith. *trypiù* 'trete, stampfe, trample,' ON. *þrífa* 'ergreifen, erfassen,' Lett. *trẽpju* 'beschmiere' (cf· IE. a^x: a^xi: a^xu 62).—Lat. *tero* 'rub, bruise, grind; tread, etc.;' ON. *þiarma* 'misshandeln;' Lith. *termenù* 'sudele.'

For 'rub': 'dry' compare the following: Lat. *tero* 'rub, grind,' *tergo* 'rub, wipe, wipe dry, etc.'—Gk. *τρύω* 'rub, rub off, *τρύγει· ηραίνει, τρύσκει· ηραίνει* (Hes.).—Similarly OHG. *hasan* 'politus,' Lith. *kasaũ, kasinù* 'kratze,' etc.: Skt. *kṣấyati* 'brennt,' *ksārá-s* 'brennend, ätzend,' Gk. *ηρός* 'dry, parched,' *ερός* 'dry (land),' Lat. *seresco*. —Gk. *ψῆν* 'rub, wipe,' *ψωρός* 'scabby,' *ψηρός* 'crumbling, dry.'

51. DRILLEN

MHG. *drillen* 'drehen, abrunden' has pp. *gedrollen* 'drall, rund gedreht.' In other dialects the verb is weak: MLG. *drillen* 'umhertreiben, rollen, drehen,' MDu. (Kilian) *drillen* 'motitare, nutare, vacillare, vagari; tremere, gyrare, rotare, volvere; tornare, etc.,' Du. *drillen* 'turn round, wield; drill, bore; drill, train, etc.' (whence probably NE. *drill*), EFries. *drillen* 'drehend hin und her bewegen, bohren; quälen, plagen,' perhaps NE. *thrill* 'tremble, throb' (but not *thrill, thirl* 'bore,' with which it is confused, OE. *þȳrlian* 'perforate,' *þȳrel* 'hole,' *þurh* 'through'). Related to *drillen* are MLG. *dral* 'rund und fest gedreht oder sich drehend, wirbelnd, EFries. *dral* 'stark, fest und dicht gedreht, rund gedreht, rund, voll, dicht, gedrungen,' NHG. *drall*, MHG. *drel* adv. 'fest, stark,' and OE. *þearl* 'strict, severe, stern' (cf. Schade, *Wb.* I10; author, a^x: a^xi: a^xu 63; similarly Holthausen, *IF.* XX, 323). These point to a Germ. base *þrel-, þarl-* 'turn, twist, etc.,' which may be compared with Skt. *taralá-s* 'zuckend, zitternd, unstät,' from *tere-* in Skt. *trásati* 'erzittert,' Gk. *τρέω* 'tremble, flee,' *τρέμω* 'tremble,' OHG. *drāen* 'drehen,' Gk. *τείρω* 'wear out,' Lat. *tero*, etc.

52. DRIMMAN

OS. *thrimman* 'schwellen,' primarily 'be compact, pressed full,' MDu. (16th cent.) pp. *duerdrommen* 'durchgedrängt, durchge-

setzt.' The MDu. form, though related to OS. *thrimman*, may be an analogical strong participle from the weak verb *drommen* 'dringen, drücken' (cf. Lubach, *Over de Verbuiging van het Werkwoord in het Ndl. der 16de Eeuw*, § 15, *opm.* 2). Here belong MLG. *drammen* 'ungestüm dringen; lärmen, poltern,' *dram* 'Bedrängnis, Not; Getümmel, Lärm,' OS. *thrim* 'Leid, Kummer,' *thrum* 'Gewalt,' OE. *þrymm* 'strength, might; glory, magnificence; host, army,' MHG. *dram* 'Schlachtgetümmel,' ON. *þrǫmmon* 'Gestampf; Balgerei,' *þramma* 'schwer treten,' *þruma* 'erdröhnen,' *þrymr* 'Lärm, Getöse,' *þrima* 'Donner; Lärm,' etc., base *trem-* 'press, stamp, crowd, etc.,' in Lett. *tremju* 'stampfe,' Lith. *tremiù* 'werfe nieder, schmettere nieder,' *isz-tremiù* 'stosse hiuaus,' etc.

For meaning compare the following: ON. *þryngua* 'drängen: anfüllen, anschwellen.'—Skt. *tṛṇátti* 'durchbohrt': OE. *þrintan* 'swell.'—Lith. *trepti* 'stampfen,' Pruss. *trapt* 'treten,' etc.: Gk. *τέρπω* 'fill, satisfy, rejoice,' Skt. *tṛ́pyati* 'sättigt sich, wird befriedigt,' Lith. *tarpti* 'gedeihen, zunehmen.'—Lat. *trūdo* 'thrust, push, crowd,' ON. *þrútenn* 'swollen.'—ON. *þrýsta* 'press, squeeze, thrust,' *þrýstiligr* 'compact, stout, robust.'

To *trem-* 'press' may also belong ON. *þruma* 'liegen; weilen, sich ruhig oder untätig verhalten,' *þrymia* 'ruhen, lagern, sich ausbreiten,' Lith. *trìmstu*, *trìmti* 'sich beruhigen,' i. e. 'be pressed down, subside.' Compare MLG. *drucken* 'drücken; refl. sich drücken, drängen; sich still verhalten, sich still entfernen,' EFries. *drükken* 'drücken, pressen, drängen; langsam arbeiten, sich aufhalten, zaudern.'

Finally *trem-* 'press, etc.,' may be referred to *tere-* 'press, rub, etc.,' in Lat. *tero* 'rub, bruise, grind; tread,' Gk. *τείρω* 'wear away,' ChSl. *trěti* 'reiben,' etc.

53. ÞRINTAN

OE. *þrintan* 'swell,' MDu., MLG. *drinten* 'anschwellen,' MHG. *drinden* '(an)schwellen, schwellend dringen' (apparently from LG. with *-nt-* softened to *-nd-*).

After the discussion of OS. *thrimman*, I need not give additional proof to show that *þrintan* may come from a base *trend-* 'press.' Such a base occurs with the developed meaning 'press':

'bore, split, wear away, etc.,' in Skt. *tr̥ṇátti*, *tardayati* 'durchbohrt, spaltet,' ChSl. *trądŭ* 'Durchfall,' Lith. *trę́ndėti* 'von Würmern gefressen werden,' *trandẽ* 'Motte, Holzwurm,' Gk. τερηδών 'Holzwurm; caries.' These two sets of words may, of course, have come independently from *tere-* 'press, rub' in Lat. *tero*, etc.

With *trendo-* 'press: be crammed, swell' in OE. *þrintan* compare **tr̥̄do-* in Lat. *tardus* 'slow, sluggish; heavy, stupid,' *tardāre* 'hinder, delay; tarry, loiter.' Compare EFries. *drükken* 'drücken, pressen, drängen; langsam arbeiten, sich aufhalten, zaudern;' MDu. *drommen* 'dringen, drücken,' ON. *þruma* 'liegen; weilen, sich ruhig oder untätig verhalten,' etc. (cf. no. 52).

54. WERÞAN

OHG. *giwerdan* 'gefallen,' impers. c. acc. pers., gen. rei, *intwerdan* 'missfallen':—OHG. *werd* 'wert, wertvoll, teuer, lieb,' *werd* 'Preis, Wert,' OS. *werđ* 'wert, passend, lieb,' as noun 'Geld, Lohn,' Goth. *wairþs*, etc., Lith. *vẽrtas* 'wert, würdig' (probably from Germ.), Welsh *gwerth* 'pretium' (cf. Schade, *Wb.* 277, 1125; Braune, *Ahd. Lb.*[5] 252).

The above contain perhaps the same base as in Lat. *verto*, Goth. *wairþan* 'werden,' etc., though not directly connected with them. The primary meaning of Goth. *wairþs*, pre-Germ. *u̯erto-*, would be 'turning, returned, given in exchange.' Compare OHG. *ūfwert(es)* 'aufwärts,' *inwert* 'inwendig,' Ir. *frith* 'gegen,' Welsh *gwrth* 'per, contra, retro, re-', etc., and, for meaning, Gk. προτί, πρός 'toward,' ChSl. *protivŭ* 'entgegen,' Lett. *pret* 'gegen,' *pretiniks* 'Gegner, gleichen Schlages oder Wertes seiend,' Skt. *práti* 'gegen,' *a-pratā* 'ohne Entgelt, umsonst,' Av. *pərəskā* (* *pr̥tskā*) 'Preis oder Wert,' Lat. *pretium* (cf. Walde, *Et. Wb.* s. v.).

For other explanations of *Wert* cf. Kluge, *Et. Wb.* s. v.; Falk og Torp II, 427, 461 f. According to Kluge the word is related to ON. *vara*, OE. *waru*, MHG. *war* 'Kaufmannsgut, Ware.' This is also possible, pre Germ. **u̯orā* 'exchange, return, Gegengeschenk.' For the primitive usage in exchange cf. Karl Bücher, *Die Wirtschaft der Naturvölker* 28 ff.

FRANCIS A. WOOD

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Modern Philology

Vol. V *January, 1908* No. 3

GALAHAD AND PERCEVAL[1]

I

The supplanting of Perceval, the nephew of the maimed fisher-king as the promised knight in the grail quest by Galahad, the son of Lancelot and Helaine, would be a remarkable enough incident in the history of mediaeval literature if the two knights were not related to each other; by the establishment of blood-relationship between the two heroes it has been rendered unique in the literary history of all times.

The discrepancies and contradictions caused in the Arthurian prose-romances by this change, which was brought about almost without protest—I take the Didot-*Perceval* to be a kind of protest—because it was flattering to the popular taste of the time, which ran high in favor of Lancelot, "the best knight in the world," are well known to all who are acquainted with the *Estoire* and *Queste del Saint Graal*, and so are the unsatisfactory results of the several attempts that have been made to elucidate the complicated situation. I need not, therefore, sacrifice any of my limited space to recapitulate either.

After devoting many years to the study of the mass of MSS and the methods of the scribes who copied them, without a knowledge of which the searcher after truth in this intricate and perplexing field of literature cannot hope to be successful, as I

[1] For the third and last instalment of the original text, see pp. 322-41, following this introduction.

had learned when I studied Malory's sources, I too have arrived at a solution of the problem, very different, as will be seen, from any proposed by scholars before me. Whether it prove acceptable to all or not, those who are qualified to judge must be impressed by the enormous amount of labor and thought I have devoted to the subject, and they cannot fail to recognize that my solution, based as it is on the MSS, is natural and more probably correct than any other, and that it is original.

Paulin Paris, who wrote upon this subject: "Il faut donc qu'il y ait eu dans le travail des arrangeurs du texte définitif une confusion dont il est devenu impossible de sortir,"[1] has already pointed out that there exists one MS at the Bibliothèque Nationale, viz., MS fr. No. 751,[2] which on fol. 444*c* contains a passage clearly demonstrating that a Perceval-quest and not a Galahad-quest was joined to the primitive *Lancelot*. I have unearthed a similar passage in MS Lansdown No. 757, British Museum, which on fol. 164*a* runs:

& lo grant conte de lancelot couient repairer au grant conte de perseuax qui est chef de toz les contes au cheualiers & tut sont branches de li par ceo que li acheua la grant queste de graal. et li conte perseuax meismes est une branche del haut conte de graal. qui est chef de toz les contes car por lo graal se trauelerent tot li bon cheualier don len parloit a cele temps.

Neither MS fr. 751 nor MS fr. 747 of the Bibliothèque Nationale is therefore any longer unique.[3]

But while only two of all the *Lancelot* MSS, known at the present day, allude to a Perceval-quest at the end of Part I,[4] all MSS and all printed editions contain more or less distorted evidence of its existence in the seventh *laisse* of Part I. After having appropriated the kingdoms of the unfortunate brothers Ban and Boors, Claudas conceives the idea of paying in disguise a visit

[1] *Romans de la table ronde*, Vol. II, p. 278. [2] *Ibid.*, Vol. IV, p. 87.

[3] In the *Athenæum*, September 1, 1906, I have claimed the credit for having found the last eight leaves of MS fr. 749, which were missing for nearly a hundred years, and for having first seen in MS, Add. 32125 British Museum, the often-discussed passage at the end of the Merlin referring to Robert de Borron's plans, and also on fol. 214*a* a unique reference to Gautier de Montbeliart."

[4] I have replaced the arbitrary division of the *Lancelot* in two parts by one suggested by the early MSS, according to which the so-called *Lancelot* proper consists of two parts equal in length to the *Agravain*.

to Logres in order to convince himself that the accounts he has received of Arthur are true and not exaggerated. He arrives in Logres at a time when Arthur, who has not been king for very long, and is only seven months married to Guenever, is still at war with some of his rebellious barons. Before reference is made in the story to Arthur's "largeshe & sa deboinarete & son grant sens & sa bonte," the charms of Guenever are extolled. She is very wise, and of such surpassing beauty that only two women of her time can be compared to her. One is "Helaine sans per," the wife, as we learn, later on, of "Persides le rous;" the other is described thus on fol. 8*d* of MS, Add. 10293:

Et lautre fu fille au roi mahaignie. Che fu li rois pelles qui fu peires a amite meire galaat chelui qui vit apertement les grans meruelles del graal. Et acompli le siege perillous de la table reonde. Et mena a fin les auentures del roialme perelleus & auentureus. Che fu li roialmes de logres. Cele fu sa suer si fu de si grantbiaute que nus des contes ne dist que a son tans fust ne se peust de biaute a lui apparellier. Et si auoit non amite en sornon. & en son droit non helizabel.

Beyond the unfamiliar name given to Pelles' daughter, this passage is only striking for the contradiction that Amide or Helizabel is said to be both Galahad's mother and his sister. Paulin Paris does not mention this passage although it is found in the MS which forms the basis of his synopsis, nor does it appear to have attracted the attention of any other scholar.

Having excited my suspicion, "cele fu sa suer" induced me gradually to examine all the *Lancelot* MSS that came into my hands. I found that while a similar passage occurs in all MSS and printed editions, only Nos. 110, 111, 113, 773 Bibl. Nat.; Royal B. vii. Brit. Mus., No. 3481 Bibl. de l'Ars., have the name "Galahad," and MSS Nos. 96, 98, 116, 118, 121, 339, 341, 751, 753, 768, 16999 Bibl. Nat.; Royal 20. D. iii Brit. Mus.; Nos. 3479–80 Bibl. de l'Ars.; No. 8230, Philip's Collect. Cheltenham, and the MS of Mr. Henry Yates Thompson, London; the printed editions of 1488, 1494, 1513, 1520 (?), 1533, and the Italian edition (without date) printed at Venice, all have "Perceval." There are variations noticeable in the names;[1] mother occurs

[1]Amide; anite; aude; amite; amides; enite. Eliabel; Elizabel; Heliabel; Helizabel; Elizabeth; Elizabet. Pelesuaus; perleuaus; perlesuax; perleuax; perceual; parceuau.

in one or two instances for sister; in one case Amide is Pelles' wife (!) and Perceval's sister. The printed editions suppress "cele fu sa suer." As a typical example I quote the passage from MS fr. No. 751 Bibl. Nat., fol. 9*c*:

& li autre si fu fille au roi mehaignie ce fu li rois pelles (peres) perleuaus. a celui qui uit apertement les granz merueilles dou graal. & acompli le siege perillox de la table reonde. & mena a fin les auanturez dou roiaume auenturex. Ce fu li regnez de logres. Cele fu sa suer si fu de si grant biate que nus des contes ne dit que nulle qui a son tans fust se poist a li de biate aparillier. Si auoit non amide a sornon. & a son droit non eliabel.

Thus the MSS afford additional evidence in favor of a Perceval-quest having been connected with the primitive *Lancelot*, but the passage as it is found in the best of them, is not of much help to the critic because it blunders in the relationship of Pelles and Perceval. At least this was my opinion. The promised knight was not the son but the nephew of the maimed fisher-king.

As almost invariably happens when one searches for something, one is inclined to overlook what is near at hand. It was the last MS I looked at which confirmed my suspicion, and realized my hopes that *uncle* must have occurred in the original MS instead of *father*. The scribe of Royal 19. C. xiii[1]—the only one of all the known MSS—has preserved the original text here, and in some other instances, but he too allows the daughter of Pelles to be both sister and cousin of Perceval, and remembering that Perceval has been supplanted by Galahad, crosses the former's name out, and writes the latter in smaller letters above it. On fol. 7*a* we read:

[1] In this MS on fol. 27*d* occurs another passage which most probably had some connection with the *P.-L. Quest*, and which has been utilized by the writer of the *Estoire*. After Lancelot has conquered "dolerous garde," the text goes on: "lors sen part de la meson & ele estoit bien a. xxx. liwes englesches loing de nohaut. sen estoit mestres uns prudoms qui auoit non lucans cil estoit del lignage Iosep de arimathije qui porta le seint graal en engleterre qui lors fu apelee la grant bretaigne cil & son lingnage conquistrent la terre mescraant a nostre seingneur & de lui gist li cors a cele meson de religion dont nus aues oi."

In MS Royal 19. B. vii, fol. 39*d* the end of this passage runs thus: "si auoit a non li mestres leucan. Cil leucan fu filz i(o)seph de barimacie cil dont li grans lignages descendi par par qui la grans bretaigne fu puis enluminee. car il aporterent le graal & conquistrent la terre mescreant. & de celui gist le cors en cele maison de religion."

While it is clear from these two MSS that Joseph's tomb was in the abbey, and that "mestres lucans" was alive when Lancelot visited the place, all other above-named MSS and printed editions call the abbey "la sepulcre lucan," and state that "de cil lucan gist li cors en cele maison de religion."

& lautre fu la fille al roi pelles le roi Mahaingne lo oncle ~~parceual~~ galaad qui uit apertemant les merueilles del seint graal. & acompli lo sege perilleus de la table ronde. & mena a fin les merueilles del roiaume auentureus co fu li reaumes de logres. cele fu sa soer si fu de si grant beaute que len ne sauoit en son tens nule si bele & auoit non amide en sornon & en son droit Eliabel.

In this form the passage is of the greatest possible critical value. It establishes the fact that in the Perceval-quest of the primitive *Lancelot* (henceforth referred to as *P.-L. Quest*, i. e., Perceval-Lancelot Quest) the same relationship existed between Perceval and the maimed fisher-king as in Chrétien and other versions. Amide[1] or Eliabel is the name of Perceval's sister, and most important of all, *Pelles, Perceval's uncle, is the maimed fisher-king.*

In *Romania*,[2] Vol. XXXVI, pp. 369–402, and pp. 543–90, I stated that I have come to the conclusion the writer of the trilogy which I have recalled from oblivion and reconstructed, made use for his quest (*G.-D. Quest*, i. e., Galahad-*Demanda* Quest) of the original Galahad quest (*G.-E. Quest*, i. e., Galahad-*Estoire*[3] Quest) modeled on *P.-L. Quest*, and that the vulgate-quest (*G.-L. Quest*, i. e., Galahad-*Lancelot* Quest) now found in the *Lancelot* is not a faithful reproduction of *G.-E. Quest.* I now add: *G.-E. Quest* together with the *Estoire* formed, at the outset, a harmoniously arranged whole, independent of the *Lancelot*, but anticipating various incidents in it in the shape of predictions or prophecies. To this conclusion I was led by studying the trilogy. The combination *Estoire* plus *G.-E. Quest* may have been the work of one or two persons. I incline to think that one man was responsible for both, for both are marked by the same characteristics; the same lack of originality and ingenuity is observable in the second, in all probability the anterior, part as in the first. The writer first modified *P.-L. Quest.* His work is at best an adaptation of the circumstances surrounding the original hero

[1] Amida is the name of Galahad's mother, Pelles' daughter in the Portuguese *Demanda.*

[2] The quest of the Holy Grail forming the third part of the trilogy indicated in the *suite du Merlin*, Huth MS.

[3] *Estoire* is short for *Estoire del Saint Graal*, the title given in the early MSS to what E. Hucher calls "*Le Grand St. Graal.*"

Perceval to the altered conditions created by the adoption of the new hero Galahad. And as Lancelot, his father, was in reality the motive of the change, he too had to be provided with a principal part. Everything points to the fact that the writer freely copied his original, often confining himself to a mere change of names. A comparison of Chrétien with *G.-E. Quest*, in so far as it is possible through the medium of *G.-D. Quest*, makes it highly probable that many incidents told of Lancelot were in the prototype associated with Perceval. Perceval, the cousin of Galahad, was relegated to the second line and placed on equal footing with Boors, the cousin of Lancelot; as a sort of compensation Perceval was allowed to keep Galahad company, and to make this arrangement less awkward Boors was added as third companion. Pelles having become the grandfather of Galahad had to cede his original part of maimed fisher-king to his brother Helain or Alain, Pel-helain, or Pel-alain, for thus, I believe, the names Pelehan and Pelean were created. When the second part was completed Robert de Borron's *Joseph of Arimathia* was dealt with in the same way as *P.-L. Quest*. All sorts of episodes and incidents were embodied which had, at the outset, no connection whatever with the grail-legend. To bridge over the space of time between the age of Joseph and that of Arthur, the genealogies were invented which connect Galahad on father's and mother's side, and the other *dramatis personae* with those figuring in the *Joseph*. But whatever were the shortcomings of the combination, inconsistency was not one of them. As the first part was by deliberate design in every respect the supplement of the second and vice-versa, there existed no discrepancies between them, there was complete harmony everywhere.

From the fact that *P.-L. Quest*, and not the *Perceval* in the Didot MS, was utilized in conjunction with Robert's *Joseph* it may be inferred that the writer did not know it. I hold, as I shall show elsewhere,[1] *that it did not yet exist.*

[1] Having copied the metrical *Joseph* and what is left of the *Merlin* some years ago for my own use from MS fr. No. 20047 Bibl. Nat., because I was unable to obtain a copy of Francisque Michel's edition of Bordeaux 1841, and F. J. Furnivall's edition of H. Lovelich's *History of the Holy Grail* (1861) was beyond my reach, I have just decided to utilize my copy for a new edition of Robert's poem.

With these preliminary remarks I now proceed to examine *G.-L. Quest*, taking F. J. Furnivall's text[1] as a basis:

In *G.-L. Quest* Pelles is, on pp. 3, 17, 122, 229, clearly stated to be Galahad's grandfather.

In contradiction to these statements we find Galahad on pp. 7 and 236 just as clearly described as the nephew of Pelles, while in the first case his grandfather is distinctly mentioned as being "le riche pescheor."

On p. 121 Galahad's grandfather Pelles (the name is not mentioned but must be inferred from the terms "car tu lengendras en la fille au roi pescheour") is the fisher-king; twice we find the name Pelles coupled with the title "le roi mehaignie," viz., pp. 188 and 235.

According to *Estoire*, *Vulgate Merlin*, *Lancelot*, Parts I and II, *G.-D. Quest*, and the *Tristan* MSS, not influenced by *G.-L. Quest*, Pelles is neither maimed nor is he called the fisher-king; his daughter, the niece of the fisher-king, is the keeper of the grail, in conformity with the degree of relationship adhered to in all versions.

It is strange, indeed, that of all the scholars who have dealt with the *G.-L. Quest*, not one has realized that in this respect, in spite of all appearances to the contrary, *G.-L. Quest* is in complete agreement with all other versions as can easily be demonstrated.

When Galahad, Perceval, and Boors have arrived at Corbenic and have been welcomed by King Pelles, who is said to shed tears of joy over his *nephew* Galahad, we read on p. 237:

> Quant vint a eure de vespres si commencha li tans a oscurchir . . . . et maintenant oirent vne vois qui lor dist. chil qui ne doiuent seoir a la table ihesu crist si sen voisent. car ia seront repeu li urai cheualier de la viande du chiel. quant il oirent cheste parole si sen alerent tout fors de laiens. fors li rois pelles qui ert preudom et heliezer son fil et vne puchele nieche le roi qui ert la plus religieuse chose que on seust en nule terre. et o ches .iii. remesent li .iii. compaignon.

Later, on p. 237, after four damsels have brought in "vns preudons mal haities par samblant et auoit vne corone sour sa

[1] F. J. Furnivall, *La Queste del Saint Graal*, Roxburghe Club, London, 1864.

teste," on a wooden bed, who welcomes Galahad as the one whom he has long expected, for "lons tans a" that he had been promised that by him he would be relieved from his suffering, a voice is once more heard:

Chil qui na este compains de la queste. Si se departeche de chi car il nest pas drois quil ni remaigne. Si tost comme cheste parole fu dite· si sen issi li rois pelles et heliezer ses fieus et la puchiele.

According to both passages Pelles is in the full enjoyment of all his faculties, both mental and physical; he is said to walk out, he is not carried, nor is he anywhere else stated to be prostrated on a sickbed, as a person whose legs are maimed would naturally be, and as the maimed king *is* in *G.-D. Quest* as in all other versions.

When on pp. 240, 241, Galahad performs the act of healing the maimed king (who is *not* named Pelles) by the holy lance and the drops of blood, the latter rises from his bed, and thanks God for his recovery; in order to do this it is evident that he must have been bedridden up to the moment the act of healing took place. The additional information that he retires to a hermitage or an abbey to spend the remainder of his days in the service of God, very similarly told in *G.-D. Quest* of Peleanz, and the almost literal agreement in the last sentences in both versions, viz:

MS fr. 343 *Bibl. Nat.*, fol. 103 *d*

et demena leienz si bone uie et si glorieuse tant com il i uesqui que nostre sires fist puis por la soe amor maint bel miracle et mainte belle merueille que nostre liure ne deuise mie.

F. J. Furnivall's text, pp. 240, 241

si fist puis nostres sires mainte biele miracle pour lamour de lui dont li contes ne parole nient ichi endroit pour che quil nen est mie mestiers.

clearly points to the fact that the prototype of the maimed king was the same in both versions, and that both descend from a common original, i. e., *G.-E. Quest*, modeled on *P.-L. Quest*.

What further proof can be needed to convince anyone that Pelles in *G.-L. Quest* is not, and is not meant to be, and cannot be the maimed king, and that the several statements to this effect are blunders, traces of *P.-L. Quest* in which they were perfectly correct, left behind through carelessness.

As to *P.-L. Quest*, we only know positively that Pelles, the maimed fisher-king, was Perceval's uncle. From *G.-D. Quest* we may however reasonably infer, and this all the more readily as all other versions agree, that Pelles' brother Pellinor was the father of Perceval and Amide. A second uncle of Perceval, named Alain or Pelean, and the father of the three brothers,[1] too, may probably have been mentioned. It is, of course, impossible to find out if Pelles' children Eliezer and Helaine as we find them in *G.-L. Quest*, in *Merlin*, in *Lancelot*, and in the *Tristan* were named, and if so, if they were not the children of Pelean.

As to *G.-E. Quest*, in so far as we are able to judge through the medium of *G.-D. Quest*, Pelean took the part of Pelles when the latter became Galahad's grandfather. Elaine thus stood to the maimed fisher-king in exactly the same relation as Perceval in *P.-L. Quest*. Pellinor remained Perceval's father.

In *G.-L. Quest* not Pelean but Pellinor takes the part played by Pelles in *P.-L. Quest*, as is shown by the earliest MSS of the *Lancelot* containing *G.-L. Quest:* "Voirs fu que li rois pellinors cui len apele lo roi Mahaingnez."[2] Pelles, as in *G.-E. Quest*, is Galahad's maternal grandfather; and as the maimed fisher-king cannot well, in contradiction to all tradition, be made father of Perceval, this part is allotted to Pellehan or Pellean, and thus the statement in *G.-L. Quest*, that has given so much trouble in the past, is naturally explained and accounted for—I mean the answer of Perceval's sister: "iou sui vostre suer & fille au roi pellehan." Most probably the mixing-up of Pellinor and Pellehan was not intended, but is the consequence of an accident.

This careless arranger is probably responsible for yet another anomaly. The niece of Pelles, who is in his and his son's company when Galahad, Perceval, and Boors come to Corbenic, and who is in MS Royal 19. C. xiii, fol. 319 *b*, thus described:

& une mut bele pucele qui estoit nece lo roi & estoit uirge en uolente & en oeure & la plus religieuse que len seust

[1] Although Pelles' family must, by inference, be assumed to have consisted of father and three sons, there is no passage to be found, as far as I know, in any of the versions, wherein all the members are mentioned, as would appear from Paulin Paris' parenthesis in *Romans de la table ronde*, Vol. II, p. 278.

[2] MS Royal 19. l. xiii, fol. 311 *c*; MS Royal 20. D. ii, fol. 267 *b*; Brit. Mus. Also several of the MSS at the Bibliothèque Nationale.

is no other than Amide or Eliabel, Perceval's sister, who has been allowed to live on in *G.-L. Quest*, oblivious of the fact that she had died after giving her blood to heal the leprous lady.

The combination of *Estoire* plus *G.-E. Quest*, it would seem, was a sort of *ballon d'essai*. When it was found that the substitution of the son of Lancelot for Perceval was approved and popular, it was decided to eliminate *P.-L. Quest* from the *Lancelot* and replace it by *G.-E. Quest*. Unfortunately the task was intrusted to the wrong man. In order to effect the change it was necessary also to eliminate certain antecedents of Perceval in the second and third parts[1] of the *Lancelot* and to replace them by an account of Galahad's conception and birth and by some information at least of the third grail quester, Boors. The result was the addition in almost exactly equal portions to the second and third parts of the *Lancelot* of a narrative very similar to the text published under the title of "Galahad and Perceval" in the current volume of *Modern Philology*. But instead of radically suppressing *P.-L. Quest* and substituting *G.-E. Quest* for it, the arranger set to work to adjust, correct, and modify *P.-L. Quest* according to *G.-E. Quest*, and, as he was neither a clever and careful, nor a judicious worker, the result of his labors was the unsatisfactory piece of work we now possess in the *Lancelot*. How superficially he accomplished his task is seen by the fact that while he replaced the name of Perceval by Galahad's, he allowed the telltale references "neueu" and "aioul" to stand, thus enabling me after more than seven centuries to find him out and expose him.

From all I have said it must have become clear that inconsistencies between *Estoire* and *G.-L. Quest* cannot be a matter of surprise. But there were none between *Estoire* and *G.-E. Quest*, and there ought to be none in the *Estoire* itself. There is, however, one passage found in Galahad's genealogy on the maternal side, which has given rise to much speculation, and which has

[1] It is surprising what great importance the scribes and arrangers of the prose-romances attached to making their parts equal in length. According to the best MSS, e. g., the *Estoire* plus R. de Borron's *Merlin* was equal in length to the *Vulgate Merlin*. The three parts of the *Lancelot* are all approximately equal in length, and if one knows, e. g., the number of leaves the *Agravain* occupies, one can, within a leaf or two, determine the beginning of the second part. The three equal parts of the trilogy are another example and the same tendency may be observed in the *Tristan* MSS.

caused trouble to more than one critic. I mean the passage which runs, e. g., in MS, Add. 32125, fol. 202*d:* "Apres le rei lambor regna pellehan son fiz qui fu maigne de .ii. cuisses . . . . de ce pellehan descendi vn rei qui ot non pelles," i. e., almost literally the same as in Royal 14. E. iii, printed on the margin of F. J. Furnivall's edition of Lovelich's metrical translation.

If this passage be correct and Pellehan, the *father* of Pelles, and not Pelles' *brother*, be "le roi mehaignie," the *Estoire* is not consistent in itself, for the simple reason that Galahad's genealogy from Josephe in comparison to his genealogy from Nascien's son Celidoine would be one generation too short, and the prophecy of the angel when he explains the wonders of the lance to Josephe and Nasciens, after the former has been struck by it, would not be fulfilled, a slip that is very unlikely to have occurred to the writer of the *Estoire.* This prophecy runs in the Mans MS, ed. E. Hucher, Vol. II, p. 312, thus:

ne jamais chou saches-tu (vraiement) les mierveilles dedens le Graal ne seront véues par nul mortel houme que un tout seul et chil sera. . . . . Et de ceste lance dont tu as estés ferus, ne sera jamais férus que uns seus hom, et chil sera roys et descendra de ton lignage, si sera li daarains des buens; chil sera férus parmi les quisses ambes deux ne ja n'en garra jusques à tant que les merueilles del saint Graal seront descouviertes à celui qui sera plains de toutes bontés. Et chil qui ces merueilles verra, si sera li daarains hom dou lignage Nascien et tout autres si comme Nasciens a estet li premiers hom qui les mierueilles dou Graal ait veues, autressi sera chil daarains hom qui les verra; car che dist li vraies crucefis au premier houme del pressieus lingnage, et au daarain aage devise à démoustrer mes merueilles, etc.

But this passage is inconsistent, too, with *P.-L. Quest*, where Pelleham, as we have seen, is said to be the father of Perceval, and with all other versions, where either Pelles himself or one of his brothers is declared to be the maimed king. The only version which appears to be, but is not in accord with the *Estoire* on this point is *G.-D. Quest*, which in so many other respects is in harmony with it, based as it is on *G.-E. Quest.* But the Pelleanz, who in *G.-D. Quest* is the maimed king, is not anywhere stated to be a brother of Pelles, Galahad's maternal grandfather, and of Pellinor, Perceval's father. From the second book of the trilogy,

much of which is found in the Huth MS, we learn that this Pelleanz was brother of one Garlan who possessed the power of rendering himself invisible when he was on horseback, and who was slain by Balaain, the knight of the two swords. It is when Pelleanz attempts to revenge his brother's death upon Balaain, that he receives the dolorous stroke, by which the kingdom of Listenois is turned into "la terre gastee ou la terre foraine," and from the effects of which he is maimed and can only recover when Galahad will visit him. The description, "roi de Listenois," points to the fact that the Pelleanz of the trilogy, too, must originally have been suggested by a brother of Pelles. This fundamental change in the second book of the trilogy, brought about by the introduction of a new element into the narrative, has but very slightly modified *G.-D. Quest*, in fact, beyond the statement attributed to the maimed king, when Galahad has come: "descouure ses cuisses, et dit ueez ci li doloreux cop que li cheualiers as deus espees fist," nothing would enable us, without the help of the second book, to recognize that the circumstances connected with the cause of the maiming are entirely different, and that the Pelleanz of the trilogy is not the Pellehan of the *Estoire*. It is, therefore, clearly proved that the *Estoire* stands alone against all other versions, in making Pelles' *father* and not his *brother* maimed king.

The prophecy above quoted confirms, too, my assertion that *G.-D. Quest* is derived from *G.-E. Quest*, and that this was in every respect in harmony with the *Estoire*. In *G.-D. Quest* (compare MS 343, fol. 103*c*, and Portuguese MS, No. 2594, fol. 180*d*) Galahad alone, as here stated, sees the wonders of the grail, and then he returns to his companions, including Perceval and Boors whom he had left behind "el paleis auenturex."

I have shown above that Pelles was not intended to be, and indeed is not the maimed king in *G.-L. Quest*, although this error has never been detected, and having been taken as a fact has upset all theories. I now ask: Is the passage in the *Estoire* cited above to be trusted? Do not the prophecy and all the other versions including *G.-L. Quest* point to the contrary?

I very much doubt that in the original MS of the *Estoire* this passage was found as it occurs in many MSS, and in the light of

all the results I have arrived at, I incline to the belief that through the oversight of one of the scribes of the early MSS, from which most of those we now have descend, something was omitted in it. That this is not a mere subterfuge to find an explanation for an enigmatic situation, but a possibility that has seriously to be taken into account by the critic dealing with the MSS of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries has been amply demonstrated in the present article. Only one MS has been shown to contain the partly correct passage referring to *P.-L. Quest;* only two MSS have not made an almost incredible mess of the passage speaking of Leucan and Joseph's tomb. There is only one solitary MS known to exist, as I have mentioned in *Romania*, Vol. XXXVI, p. 381, in which is found the passage mentioning Ygerne's illness and death caused by her ever-growing longing for her lost son, i. e., Arthur. There are only two MSS found in which Robert de Borron's plans are discussed at the end of his *Merlin*, while only one has the reference to Gautier de Montbeliart. Many more instances might be adduced if any were needed.

My suspicion that the passage is faulty is strengthened by other points.

While in the form above quoted the indications of omissions have been suppressed, the passage[1] as it runs, e. g., in the Mans MS, E. Hucher, Vol. III, p. 295, shows a different aspect:

> Apries le roy Lambor régna Pellehans et ses fieus qui fu mahagnies des .ii. quisses . . . . Et d' icelui Pelleham descendi uns roys qui ot non Pelles.

This is not the ordinary way, at least not in prose, of declaring that Pellehans is the son of Lambor. I take it that "fieus" does not imply a son of Lambor, but of Pellehans, and I am confirmed in this belief by the suppression lower down of "fieus" in reference to Pelles, which certainly existed in the original, as it is still to be found in other MSS. It was, too, in the MS which Henry Lovelich the Skinner translated, for in the Corpus Christi MS, ed. F. J. Furnivall, p. 373, ll. 495–97, we read:

[1] I have seen somewhere at Paris, Cheltenham, or Brussels a MS which still more strongly suggests that this passage is not reliable, but I cannot, at the present moment, lay hands on my note.

thanne Aftyr Of this kyng PelleAn
discendid Anothir ful worthy Man,
his owne Sone, and was Called Pelles.

This translation not only proves that Pelles was called Pellean's *son*, but it also suggests by the term "anothir" that at least one man was mentioned before who also descended from Pellean, and who was also "his owne Sone." Who was this son? My answer is, the maimed king, who is described as having been wounded "en une bataille (de Roume)." And the *Vulgate Merlin* makes my answer more definite by supplying his name, viz., Alain or Helain.

Upon another occasion I hope to show that what we now call the *Vulgate Merlin* stands to an original or primitive *Merlin*, which there is every reason to believe was anterior to several sections at least of the *Lancelot*, and which too must have ended with a *Mort Arthur* in about the same relation as *G.-L. Quest* to *G.-E. Quest;* in other words, that it is a careless piece of work, one in which many statements contradicting one another have been allowed to subsist.

As to this *Mort Arthur*, in which not Lancelot but Gavain was the best knight in the world, and the love of Lancelot for Arthur's queen found no place, I have strong reason to suppose that it supplied the poet of the English metrical version, represented by Robert Thornton's MS in the library of Lincoln Cathedral, with the framework or the source of his romance,[1] and it was most probably also the one which was known to the man who felt called upon in the first quarter of the thirteenth century, to supply *a* (not the) third link to Robert de Borron's *Joseph* and *Merlin* by writing under the much-abused title of *Prophecies of Merlin* what is known by the name of the Didot-*Perceval.*

There are four passages in the *Vulgate-Merlin* which concern us here. I have seen them in all the known *Merlin* MSS in London, Paris, Brussels, and Cheltenham,[2] but as there do not exist

[1] As Huchown was a poet of no mean order we may well assume that he has not so servilely dealt with his French source as Henry Lovelich did with the *Grail* and *Merlin*, but has "adorned his tale."

[2] Bibl. Nat. MSS fr. 337, 747, 344, 770, 95, 24394, 110, 749, 19162, 105, 9123, 98, 96, 117, 113, 332, 112; Bibl. de l'Arsénal: Nos. 3350, 3479, 3480, 3482; Brit. Mus. Add. 10292, Harl. 6340, Philip's Collect. Cheltenham, Nos. 1045, 1046, 1047, 3630, 3643; printed editions of 1498, Rouen (undated), 1528; the English prose *Merlin* and Henry Lovelich's metrical translation. His copy of the latter Dr. E. Kock kindly sent me from Lund, as only part of it is so far published by the Early English Text Society.

any important variations between the MSS, I have elected to quote these passages according to one of the earliest ones in the Bibliothèque Nationale, viz., MS fr.[1] 747. On fol. 116*c* of this MS we read:

1

ne par deca del roi pelles de listenois car il garde le roi pellinor son frere qui gist malades dune maladie dont il naura iames garison tant que cil uenra laienz qui les auentures del saint graal metra a fin que cil. Ne del roi alfin[2] lor frere qui gist malades qui ne gaira iusqua tant que li meldres cheualiers (des) bretons uenra & li aura demande por coi il ot cele maladie & quel chose li graax est (&) que len an sert.

On fol. 129*b* there is found the following paragraph[3] which deals with the same subject as the one quoted above from the *Lancelot*, very probably a reproduction of it, extolling Guenever's beauty and stating that only two women of her time are comparable to her, viz., "Helainne sans per qui fu feme persides le rous," and

2

la fille le roi pelles de listenois del chastel de corbenyc. qui fu niece le riche roi pescheor & le roi malade de plaies dont li uns ert apelez alains des illes an listenois. & cil ert malades de maladies de plaies & li riches rois qui estoit apelez mehaigniez estoit naurez parmi les .ii. cuisses de la lance uengeresse & fu apelez par son droit non quant il estoit en sante li rois pellinor de listenois. & li rois alains & li rois pelinor si furent frere germain & cele pucele dont ie uos di si estoit lor niece & fille le roi pelles qui frere (estoit) a ces .ii. dont ie uos ai dit icele pucelle fu la plus bele que len ueist onques an la terre & la plus nete. icele garda le santisme graal iusquitel ior que galaad fu engendrez.

The last two passages are the only ones in the *Merlin* where the name of Perceval occurs.

[1] I purposely avoid MS fr. 337, generally, according to Paulin Paris' example, stated to be the earliest *Merlin* MS known, because I do not share this opinion; why, I shall explain when I shall deal with the *Vulgate Merlin*.

[2] All other MSS have Alain, Alein, or Helain.

[3] This is also imitated in the *Tristan*. On one occasion Celices asks Lancelot whom the latter considers the most beautiful woman. Lancelot replies Guenever surpasses all; the second is Iseut of Cornwall, the third, "Helaine sans pair," the fourth, "la fille du roi Pelles;" in some MSS the third is "Helaine la fille de Pelles," and the fourth "la reine d'Orcanie." Compare E. Løseth, *Analyse critique des MSS du Tristan*, etc., §484. In the *Estoire* the lines: "Ichil ot une fille qui passa de biautet toutes les femmes qui onques fuissent en la Grant-Bretaigne se cou ne fu seulement la royne Genievre la femme le roy Artu" (E. Hucher, Vol. III, pp. 295, 296) are suggested by this passage.

Of all the knights who distinguished themselves in the battle of Bredigan was one who surpassed all the rest of them. This was a certain Nasciens of whom we read on fol. 150*c*:

3

& li contes des ueraies estoires dit & tesmoigne quil estoit cousins germains perceual lou galois de par sa mere dont il parlera ca auant car leus nan est ores mie. si dit ancores li conte que il (fu) bien proichiens paranz ioseph de barimacie car il fu filz anhignes[1] la seror Joseph qui fu fame & espouse ambron qui. xii. fil orent dont la terre de bretaigne fu puis anluminee & paranz proichiens celidoigne le fil au roi nasciens deberique qui la grant meruoille del saint graal uit premierement & si apartint moult de pres au roi pelles de listenois & a ses freres. Icil ot puis maint ior Galaad le fil lancelot dou lac (en sa baillie).

This Nasciens, the text continues, was named after the duke Nasciens, who was such a good man. Later on he became a hermit and priest. He was the one who was transported by the Holy Ghost into the third heaven, where he beheld the Holy Trinity. He, too, is the one who by the command of God copied "la sainte estoire," i. e., *lestoire del saint graal* with his own hand, which was joined to Blaise's book. This Nasciens was the hermit who advised Arthur when he was in danger of losing his land, before he became the friend of Galehaut, *le haut prince.*

And the last passage on fol. 179*b* refers to an incident which is told in *Perceval li Gallois* concerning Arthur's son Lohot, who was killed by Kex, the seneschal of whom it is stated:

4

Mes loiaus cheualiers uers son seignor & uers la reine fu il toz iorz iusqua la mort. ne onques en sa uie ne fist traison que une seule & ce fu de lohot le fil au roi artus que il ocist par enuie en la grant forest perilleuse. Ensi come li conte le uos deuisera ca auant moult loing. quant ma matiere mi amenra. Mes itant en dit li contes que perceual li galois lencusa a cort. Ensi comme .i. hermites li reconta qui li auoit veu ocire & tuer.

A perusal of these four passages will convince anyone versed in the grail-literature that they contain references to the *Estoire* and to two different versions of the quest.

The *Merlin*, there can be no doubt, before it was adjusted to the *Lancelot* as we now possess it, took it for granted that Perce-

[1] MS 749: "harengues;" "ebron;" MS 337: "enhyngeus;" "nesecuj" (for brons).

val was the promised knight, who had to ask his uncle, the maimed fisher-king, before he could heal him, what the cause of his malady was, what the grail was, and what purpose it served. Whether the quest referred to was *P.-L. Quest* or Chrétien, it is not yet possible to say, but the former seems to me more likely to be the case than the latter.

The man who performed the task of adjusting the *Merlin* to the *Lancelot*, if he was not by chance identical with the one who so admirably (!) adapted the combination *Estoire* plus *G.-E. Quest* to it, as we have seen above, must have greatly resembled him mentally. That *Estoire* plus *G.-L. Quest* was utilized for the purpose, and not *Estoire* plus *G.-E. Quest*, is clearly shown, amongst others, by the following points: (1) Pelles, the grandfather of Galahad, is neither maimed nor fisher-king; (2) Pellinor, and not as in *G.-D. Quest* Pel-Alain, is the "riche pescheor et le roi mahaignie;" (3) The several references to Lancelot and Galahad and to the latter's genealogies which are brought in when the descent of Nasciens is explained; (4) The mentioning of Nasciens the hermit.

It only remains for me to explain the existence, side by side, of two maimed kings, Pellinor and Alain, both brothers of Pelles, and therefore both uncles of Elaine. I have above shown that if we may conclude from *G.-D. Quest*, Helain, Alain, or Pel-helain, Pel-alain was the maimed fisher-king in the combination *Estoire* plus *G.-E. Quest*. I have also pointed out that instead of substituting *G.-E. Quest* for *P.-L. Quest*, the arranger of the *Lancelot* created the anomalous and inconsistent *G.-L. Quest*. The *Merlin*[1]

[1] In the chapter of the *Merlin* dealing with the mission of Lot and his sons to the rebel kings to bring about a truce, and induce them to take common action with Arthur against the Sesnes, we are told that they meet on their way to Arestuel in Scotland a young squire, named Eliezer, the son of Pelles, who is anxious to find Gavain. He wishes to serve him whom he considers the best knight in the world and to obtain the order of knighthood from him. In this connection Eliezer mentions an uncle whom he is anxious to heal, and Pelles speaks of his little girl only five years old who keeps the holy grail. This passage is undoubtedly an interpolation adapted from some other romance. "C'est peut-être le seul fragment conservé d'une branche que les assembleurs auront eliminée. Cette branche, je suppose, était encore l'œuvre de Robert de Borron et contenait la suite des aventures d'Alain et de ses frères." These are Paulin Paris' remarks in *Romans de la Table Ronde*, Vol. II, p. 277. As to being R. de Borron's work, this is out of the question: Pelles lived nine generations after Alain! But that we have to deal here with the fragment of a branch, very probably *P.-L. Quest*, is hardly doubtful. Eliezer plays a part in *G.-D. Quest*; he is twice mentioned in *G.-L. Quest*. What I have above said about the children of Pelles already figuring in *P.-L. Quest*, probably as the third brother Alain's children, appears not to be improbable, when we remember in that version Pelles was the maimed king.

affords evidence that my explanation was not a mere conjecture. The existence of the two maimed kings has a very simple and natural cause. Pellinor owes his presence to *G.-L. Quest*, Alain to the *Estoire*. The adjuster of the *Merlin* finding in the *Estoire* Alain described as the maimed king, and in *G.-L. Quest* Pellinor, found himself in a dilemma, but rather than suppress the wrong king, he decided to let them both exist.[1]

And what is the lesson of it all? The deeper I penetrate into this "*dédale inextricable*," as the late Gaston Paris called the Arthurian prose-romances, the more I feel the truth of what I stated in the Preface to "*Le Roman de Merlin*": the original form of the Arthur-saga will be found to be exceedingly simple. And I realize more than ever that there must have existed before the versions we know others giving an entirely different account of Arthur and Guenever, of Gavain and Lancelot, which were of superior quality, more poetical, more truly representative of popular tradition, and more accurately reflecting the romantic spirit of the Middle Ages. In other words, it becomes clearer and clearer to me that what has come down to us of the Arthurian romances is but a poor substitute, at best a spoilt réchauffé of earlier material, and valuable and interesting only because it is all we have inherited to enable us to form an idea of what we have lost.

II

The adventures printed in *Modern Philology*, Vol. V, pp. 55–84, 181–200 and 322–41, under the title "Galahad and Perceval," from the *Tristan* MS, Add. 5474, fol. 152*c*–64*a*, British Museum,

[1] The scribe of MS 749, while allowing in the second passage on fol. 200*c* two maimed kings to exist, adopts in the first passage on fol. 183*b* the erroneous statement of *G.-L. Quest* regarding Pelles: "Ne par deca dou roi pelles de listenois natendons nul secors deuant ce que li mieudres cheualiers dou monde viegne a lui & li demant dont cele maladie li vient et quel chose est li graaus." This may be the shape of the passage (accidentally left untouched) before the adjuster added to Pelles' name, "who has to take care of his brother Pellinor, etc.: nor can we hope for help from their brother Alain, etc.," in perfect harmony with *P.-L. Quest*, in which the maimed Pelles really would have been waiting to be healed by his nephew Perceval. Thus this passage would be additional evidence not only of the existence of *P.-L. Quest* but of its connection with a primitive *Merlin*, just as the quotation from the seventh *laisse* of the first part of the *Lancelot* pointed to its having been joined to that romance. In view of the second passage, however, it must be admitted that another explanation is not impossible, viz., that the scribe, as not infrequently happened, omitted two lines on fol. 183*b*.

have, at least in their present form, like other sections of the enlarged second part of the *Tristan*, never been published.

These adventures are told by Sir Thomas Malory in the eleventh and twelfth books of *Le Morte Darthur*, and they represent, in two almost equal portions, the additions which the arranger deemed necessary to the primitive *Lancelot*, when he replaced *P.-L. Quest* by *G.-L. Quest*.

In my *Studies on the Sources*, I have briefly compared the corresponding section of *Le Morte Darthur* with the account found in the *Lancelot*. I have pointed out how Malory, recognizing that there were two bearers of the name of Perceval in his French source—the one already a knight of standing and renown is mentioned in the *Tristan*-section, according to the earlier version, the other still a young squire whose arrival at Arthur's court and subsequent receiving the order of knighthood are told in these adventures, according to the later version—suppressed one of them. As he, apparently, did not understand that the former was the original achiever of the grail-quest, while the latter was only Perceval's shadow, the companion of Galahad[1] who had usurped his place, it is not surprising that Malory suppressed the wrong one. What I have said in *Studies* is in the main applicable to the present text. I do not therefore repeat it, reserving my limited space for matters more important.

Already in 1891–92, I was struck by the occurrence of these adventures in a *Tristan* MS, where they were added by an inconsiderate scribe who was unaware that, at least as far as Perceval is concerned, they contradicted what he had previously written. I then arrived at the conclusion that these twenty-two leaves of MS 5474 represented a fragment of a romance, intimately related to, very probably copied from, the *Lancelot*. This hypothetical romance I provisionally named *suite de Lancelot*, without attaching any special value to the term *suite*. What this romance was like in its entirety, whether it was a mere condensation of corresponding sections in the *Lancelot* or embodied material not found therein, I could only conjecture.

[1] In the fifteenth century the *Vulgate* version had for so long been the one read by everyone, that nobody had any idea there ever was another promised knight than Galahad.

E. Wechssler, in his pamphlet *Über die verschiedenen Redaktionen*, etc.,[1] is the only scholar, as far as I know, who expressed the opinion that I was not justified in postulating such a romance, as he could not prove its existence. What I describe as *suite de Lancelot* represents, according to his theories, *Bruchstücke der älteren Redaktion, A.*

As I have in *Romania*,[2] I think convincingly, proved that Wechssler's bold theories on the growth and development of the prose-romances are no longer tenable, I need here only explain that the unfortunate term *suite* applied by the late G. Paris, in a special sense, to the unique continuation of Robert de Borron's *Merlin* in the Huth MS has misled Wechssler to direct a series of arguments, not against my hypothetical romance, but against a creation of his own fancy. I did not in 1892, as he imagines, bring the *suite du Merlin* in any connection whatever with the hypothetical *suite de Lancelot.* Not a word in my *Studies* can be found that can furnish an explanation of his incomprehensible statement concerning my attitude to the Huth *Merlin:* "wie er denn überhaupt von dieser Branche ausgeht." Nor do I state anywhere that I understand by *suite de Lancelot*, "eine neue Romanreihe."

Seeing that Wechssler starts from such erroneous premises, and fails to see my point, it is not surprising that he should end by arriving at the conclusion: "Sommer verbindet mit der Bezeichnung *suite* (*de*) *Lancelot* keinen völlig klaren Begriff."

If I had meant by *suite de Lancelot* what Wechssler imagined I meant, I should have to admit this statement as perfectly correct. But I never dreamt of raising my hypothetical romance to the rank of a *Cyklus;* I never placed it on a common basis or in co-ordination with the *Map-Cyklus*, nor did I call it younger than this combination, for the very simple reason that I did not even make use of the term.

My *Studies* on Malory's sources were my first humble effort in the field of Arthurian romance, to which I had been quite nat-

[1] Eduard Wechssler, *Über die verschiedenen Redaktionen des Robert von Borron zugeschriebenen Graal-Lancelot-Cyklus*, Halle a. S., 1895.

[2] *Romania*, Vol. XXXVI, pp. 369-402, and pp. 543-90.

urally led to pay attention in the course of my studies of Spenser's *Faerie Queen*, and which, on account of the very difficulties they presented, greatly fascinated me. Owing to circumstances beyond my control, on the one hand, and to the vastness of the subject on the other, I was limited to the MSS in the British Museum, and I confined myself to Malory. I did not attempt in 1890–92 to solve any of the many problems met with in studying the cycle, nor did I trouble about the claims of Robert de Borron or Walter Map to the authorship of this or that romance; when I, now and then, touched upon the cycle as a whole, it was by accident, rather than by design.

It is a source of great satisfaction to me to know now, when I have acquired a very different grasp of the subject, that I may still look upon my *Studies* written sixteen years ago, as a creditable performance, one that has not belied the highly favorable criticism it elicited from such eminent scholars as the late Gaston Paris, the late Eugen Koelbing, and Sir John Rhys, and that I have been able successfully to refute two or three critics, who, with a view to gaining fame, had selected very small sections of my work for the exercise of their ingenuity.

Even if Wechssler's theories could be substantiated in every respect, a *suite de Lancelot*, such as I have postulated, is not an impossibility, for these adventures might very well be simultaneously a fragment of such a romance and "Bruchstücke der ungekürzten Redaktion A," but it must be clearly understood that I do not claim this romance to be "ein Originalwerk!"

If there existed any foundation in fact for Wechssler's differentiation between the *Map-* and *Robert-Cyklus*, a romance such as I conjectured as being a compilation (much like the enlarged second part of the *Tristan*), a welding together of adventures of Sir Lancelot principally derived from the *Vulgate Lancelot*, with a probable addition of such features from other sources that seemed best calculated to enhance the glory of the title hero, to make it more exclusively what the *Lancelot* is not, viz., a *roman de Lancelot*, portions of it might have been derived, indiscriminately, from the *Map-* and the *Robert-Cyklus*, indeed, if there were the slightest cause to render such an assumption necessary, several

"selbständige Originalwerke" might have been incorporated in it.

Now, after having seen most of the existing MSS of the Arthurian romances accessible in public and private libraries in England and on the Continent, I am much inclined to assume, to Malory's credit,[1] that his share in the patching together of the various scraps from the different versions was really smaller than I had thought sixteen years ago. To judge from the curious compilations represented by some MSS of the fifteenth century that have passed through my hands, I consider it very probable that there existed in Malory's days not one but several such French books which in their main features strongly resembled his own compilation, and it would be quite reasonable to suppose that one or two of them were the "Frensshe bokes" which his author according to William Caxton "reduced into Englysshe."

But while these adventures probably formed part of a lost romance, and while they could very well have been *Bruchstücke der ungekürzten Redaktion A*, had such a romance ever existed, they certainly were connected with the *suite du Merlin*, a fact Wechssler had already correctly recognized in 1895, and of which he erroneously assumed that I, too, was then cognizant. I only realized the connection between these adventures and the Huth *Merlin*, after I had proved this to belong to the trilogy, and after I had established the fact that portions of the *Tristan* were derived from the trilogy.

In my articles in *Romania*,[2] referred to before, I have shown that there existed a French trilogy written about 1228, which was afterward translated into Spanish and Portuguese, and utilized by Italian writers. The first part of this trilogy was made up of the *Estoire del Saint Graal* and Robert de Borron's *Merlin;* the second consisted of the *suite du Merlin*, as found in the Huth MS, foll. 75*a*–230*b* + foll. 22*a*–57*d* of MS fr. 112, Bibl. Nat., plus some portion unknown, while a quest of the grail and a *Mort Arthur* formed the third.

[1] But this admission of mine does not in any way alter my estimation of him as an author.

[2] Vol. XXXVI, pp. 369–402, and pp. 543–90.

A study of the trilogy as a whole will convince anyone that an account of Galahad's conception and birth, Perceval's arrival at Arthur's court, and some information about Boors and his son, Helain le blanc, must have occurred somewhere in it; as I have been able to account for the whole of the contents of the trilogy except a portion of the second part preceding the quest of the grail, at the beginning of the third part, it can only have, appropriately, occurred there, and by placing it there, the unknown portion of the second part is also very nearly complete and lacks very likely not more than one *laisse* giving an account of Pellinor's death through the hand of Gavain, to revenge his father Lot's death.

III

In 1889–91, while I was studying Malory's sources, E. Løseth[1] was engaged upon his critical analysis of the *Tristan* MSS in Paris. The results of our labors were almost simultaneously published.[2] Løseth's work is a very creditable achievement, but it has one great defect, for which its author is, however, not responsible, and that is its too great conciseness, frequently at the expense of clearness. The fairness of this criticism, Løseth had ten years later, when he examined[3] the *Tristan* MSS in the British Museum an excellent opportunity to verify personally. In connection with the MSS his analysis is a welcome and valuable guide.

There are no less than twenty-four *Tristan* MSS in the Bibliothèque Nationale,[4] seventeen of which contain the second part.

[1] E. Løseth, *Le roman en prose de Tristan . . . . analyse critique d'après les manuscripts de Paris*, 1891; 8vo.

[2] I had no idea of Løseth's plans till I saw his book.

[3] The analysis fills more than five hundred pages, a great deal of which is set up in very small type; and yet Løseth, as he himself declares, when examining the London MSS, found his notes too brief.

[4] For other existing *Tristan* MSS see Løseth, *Préface*, p. iv, and *Additions et corrections*, p. 477. On the occasion of a brief visit to Vienna I have looked through the three splendid *Tristan* MSS at the "K. k. Hofbibliothek." My time was too short to analyze these bulky volumes minutely, but my knowledge of the Paris and London MSS enables me to declare that they do not contain anything not found in one or other of those MSS. As I was especially interested in the Grail-quest, I have carefully examined this portion of the MSS, in which they show substantial agreement. Referring for the sake of briefness to the three MSS: No. 2542 by X, No. 2537 by Y, and No. 2539–40 by Z, I found: The second part of the *Tristan* begins in X, on fol. 192*a*; in Y, on fol. 206*c*; in Z, on fol. 219*a*. Sir Tristan is made a companion of the Round Table in X, on fol. 222*a*; in Y, on fol. 233*a*; in Z, Vol. II, fol. 247*c*. Tristan's death through stabbing from behind is recorded in X, on fol. 487*a*; in Y, on fol.

Løseth has arranged these in the following six groups: I: 757, 1434, 104; II: 12599, 755, 760; III: 103; IV: 336; V: 772, 97, 349, 101, (776); VI: 99, 94, 758, 22440. Groups I and II represent the better ("la première et la meilleure") version; the other groups the common ("la version cyclique au commune") version. When Løseth wrote, this division was satisfactory enough. After my studies of the trilogy and the origin of the *G.-L. Quest*, it will be possible to improve upon it considerably. The terms "better" and "common" were, even in 1890, not happily chosen. Ward's second part and enlarged second part appear to me preferable. This Løseth has, evidently, recognized himself, for he finds it necessary to add in a note that, as the whole romance might possibly have been "cyclique" he will apply this term to the MSS of the first part "qui renvoient à la Mort Artu," and to those of the second part, "qui intercalent la queste du saint graal dans son entier." While the first two groups are of greater interest for the *Tristan* itself, the other groups are of greater importance for the study of the Arthurian romances as a whole.

As far as Malory is concerned, one single MS belonging to Group IV, viz., No. 99, is of especial interest; speaking of this Løseth declares: "Malory représente essentiellement le même texte que 99."[1] As this MS is representative of the common version, Malory has again, whether by choice or by accident—as in the case of the *suite du Merlin*—incorporated the version in his compilation, which is of greater interest to the critic.

For my critical examination of the *Tristan* section in *Studies*, the results of which I was compelled by want of space to indicate but briefly (pp. 279–90), I had only the MSS in the British Museum and the printed editions at my disposal. Not only has Løseth confirmed the result of my labors, but without any inten-

476*a*; in Z, Vol. II. fol. 225*d*. The Grail-quest occupies in X, on foll. 353*e*-500*f*; in Y, foll. 331*c*-442*a*; in Z, Vol. II. foll. 76*b*-343*d*. According to Løseth's arrangement, X belongs to group V; Y and Z, to group I or II. Other details, that I noticed, I must reserve for another cocasion.

[1] The adventures relating the conception and birth of Galahad, the arrival of Perceval at Arthur's court, etc., are also told in MSS 101, 97, 349, and 758, in Paris, and No. 2542, foll. 335*e*-53*e* in Vienna.

tion of doing so he has adduced the proof that the theory which I advanced as to the probable shape of the MS Malory used, is correct in every detail.

In explanation of these facts [I state in *Studies*, pp. 288, 289] I submit the following theory which strikes me as highly plausible: Malory possessed a MS which contained: (1) The contents of Part I of the *Vulgate Tristan*, as reproduced by him in Books VIII and IX; (2) The contents of Part II of the *Vulgate* up to the point where, as I have shown (p. 283), the quest of the Holy Grail is *mentioned*—identical with Part I of the enlarged *Tristan*, up to the point where the quest *begins* (p. 285), save, of course, those variants of style and slight and insignificant modifications noticeable between all the existing MSS of the *Tristan*—but this section was already enlarged by (*a*) the *intercalation* (at the point determined by Malory, Book X, chap. xxxi) of the adventures of "Alysander le orphelyn" and the great tournament of Galahalt of Surluse as found attached to the *Prophecies of Merlin* said to be translated from the Latin by Richard of Ireland,[1] (*b*) to which were *added* the incidents relative to Lancelot derived from a *suite de Lancelot*, etc.

All this applies to the MS No. 99, as a comparison to my statement with Løseth, §§ 20, 192, 337, and 388*a*, etc., will show. Malory's MS, therefore, must have been copied from a MS like the one from which No. 99 was copied; at any rate both must have been derived from the same archetype.

Having seen the British Museum MSS in September, 1901, Løseth published[2] a brief account of them in 1905. His examination of these MSS, however, appears to have been of a very cursory character, and several points seem to have escaped him altogether. He did not notice the repetition of the meeting of Tristran with Palamades, derived from two different versions, and he overlooked the fact that in one of these MSS (Royal 20. D. ii) Pellinor is the maimed king in the quest, not Pelles. As I have, for a different purpose, studied the three MSS of the enlarged second part of the *Tristan*, viz.: Add. 5474 (A); Royal 20. D. ii (R), and Egerton 989 (E), I am able to supplement Løseth's account in several respects. Whilst admitting that these MSS do not favorably compare with the many in Paris, I claim that it

[1] These adventures I printed from MSS Add. 25434 and Harl. 1629 as an appendix to *Studies*.

[2] E. Løseth, *Le Tristan et le Palamède des Manuscrits Français du British Museum*, Christiania, 1905, 38 pp.

is possible to make up from them a very satisfactory text of the second part of the *Tristan*, representing the same version as Groups IV and V.

The account of these MSS in H. Ward's *Catalogue of Romances*, Vol. I, pp. 359–62, is correct as far as E is concerned; slightly to be modified as to R, and to be corrected and completed with regard to A.[1] Besides the one leaf stated to be lacking at the end of A, I found twenty-three more missing, viz., one leaf[2] after each of foll. 11, 13, 82, 108 (cf. R, foll. 15, 19*v*, 20*r*, 111, 139); ten leaves between foll. 205*d* and 206*a* (cf. E, foll. 72–130); and lastly, nine leaves[3] between foll. 266*d* and 267*a* (cf. R, foll. 265–74). Smaller or larger portions are torn out or off: foll. 19, 43, 79, 139, 178, 182, 217, 263, 267. Portions of foll. 2*r*, 10*r* and *v*, 15*r*, 114*v*, 144*v*, are much worn and partly effaced.

And, as I further found, that besides the slight imperfections at the beginning and end recorded by H. Ward, there are about twenty-four leaves missing in R, between foll. 191*d* and 192*a*, i. e., the beginning of Sir Tristan's adventures in the quest of the grail, corresponding to the contents of foll. 1–120 in E, the gap in A, after fol. 205*d*, can only be made good from E. A, fol. 205*d*, corresponds to E, fol. 72, and A, fol. 206*a*, to E, fol. 130.

This deficiency in R, it must be admitted, could only be found by reading the MS. These leaves must have already been absent from the MS copied by the scribe of A, for the catchword on fol. 191*d* corresponds to the first line of fol. 192*a*.

If A and R were quite complete, the absence of the contents of A, foll. 144*a*–62*b*, from R (which in A are added from another version) would constitute the only material difference between the two MSS. A is written in the north of France, R most probably in the Netherlands.

[1] H. Ward's two references to the edition of 1520 are not accurate. For "Vol. II, p. ix, col. 2," read, "Vol. II, fol. 9 *verso*, col. 2;" for "Vol. II, p. x," read "Vol. II, fol. 10 *recto*, col. 1."

[2] One leaf in A contains as much as 1.1 of R, or 5.6 of E. One leaf in R is about equal to 0.9 of A, or. 5.0 of E.

[3] After A, fol. 266*d*, last line: "mier cheualier le roi ban qui moururent," which corresponds to R, fol. 265*b*, line 1. (The missing portion of the sentence is: "en la queste del saint graal mes or lesse li contes a parler dels & retornea parler del bon cheualier galaaz.") There are about ten leaves lacking in A; their contents are represented by R, foll. 265*b*, l. 2 to 274*c*, l. 37.

A, foll. 1–142, and R, foll. 1–174, relate all that is told in the second part of the *Vulgate Tristan*, save as to the contents of the last few leaves giving the different account of Sir Tristan's death, etc., such as is to be found in the printed editions, and in one MS, viz., No. 103, at the Bibliothèque Nationale.

On A, fol. 142*a* (R, fol. 174*a*), occurs a passage beginning:

Or dist li contes quant chil de loenois se furent aperceu que tristran demouroit en la ioieuse garde a tel ioie & a tel deduit . . . . vint vns preudons hermites & des aintisme loy & relegieus durement pour quí diex faisoit maintes vertues apertement (&) fist assauoir au roi artu que a pentecouste qui deuoit estre uenroit li sains uaissfaus en sa maison celi meesme con apiele greal, etc.

A, foll. 142–44, and R, foll. 174–76, give the account of the meeting between Tristran and Palamedes, when the former is proceeding unarmed to Arthur's court. While in R, after this, the quest begins as in the majority of the MSS, there occurs in A the interpolation of the adventures as published in *Modern Philology*, Vol. V, pp. 55–84, 181–200 and 322–41, and a second account of the meeting between Tristran and Palamedes on foll. 162–64, which has been marked on pp. 337–41 by different type.

R, as it stands, and A, without foll. 144–64, would be representative of Groups III and IV.

The twofold occurrence of the meeting between Tristran and Palamedes is easily explained. The first is the one occurring in most of the MSS; the second is taken with the interpolated adventures from another version which is found only in the few MSS named *supra*, p. 314, n. 1. The scribe of A, probably already the one whose MS he copied, incorporated the contents of foll. 144–62 from another MS, and in so doing, as he did his work mechanically like most of these scribes, without paying much attention to what he wrote, he did not notice that his own MS already contained on foll. 142–44 an account of this meeting.

The quest of the grail joined to the *Tristan* (*G.-T. Quest*, i. e., *Galahad-Tristan Quest*) I shall now briefly compare with the *Vulgate* (*G.-L. Quest*), taking as a basis F. J. Furnivall's text, in which it occupies 247 printed pages.

G.-T. Quest is in the main, as I stated in *Romania*, a combina-

tion of *G.-L. Quest* and *G.-D. Quest*. Five-sixths of it are hardly more than a transcript of these two versions. The last sixth consists of incidents derived from earlier *Tristan* material not improbably in verse, and adventures adapted from the *Lancelot*, *G.-D. Quest*, and other versions, or invented for the occasion to join the narrative. These incidents will have to be subjected to a closer critical examination than I have been able to devote to them. There is a very great probability that the enlargement of the second part of the *Tristan* was carried out, if not by the same man as in the case of the trilogy, by one who worked in partnership with him.

Of the 247 pages[1] *G.-L. Quest* occupies in the printed text, only between nineteen and twenty pages are not found in any shape in *G.-T. Quest*, viz., the contents of pp. 131–44 and pp. 176–80, the former representing the whole of chapter vii, the latter part of chapter ix. Both of these passages deal exclusively with adventures of Sir Gavain, who, although not painted quite so black in *G.-T. Quest* as in *G.-D. Quest*, is nevertheless described, as a man and a knight, far from perfect, thus strongly contrasting with the personality of Arthur's nephew known to us in earlier versions.

Many of the adventures, especially in the second part of *G.-L. Quest*, which are in *G.-D. Quest* recorded very similarly, but not exactly in the same manner, are in *G.-T. Quest* more in agreement with the latter version.

Such incidents are (to name but a few): the meeting of Galahad, Perceval, and Boors with the damsel on Salomon's ship. While in *G.-L. Quest* she introduces herself immediately after they enter the boat as Perceval's sister and the daughter of Pellean, in *G.-T. Quest*, as in *G.-D. Quest*, her identity is only disclosed when the question arises as to how the king's daughter

[1] Chap. i, pp. 1-22, corresponds to A, foll. 165*a*–72*a*; chap. ii, pp. 23–45, to A, foll. 172*a*–75*a*; chap. iii, pp. 36–45, to A, foll. 175*b*–77*b*; chap. iv, pp. 46–61, to A, foll. 177*b*–78 + foll. 232*c*–235*b*; chap. v, pp. 63–102, to A, foll. 235*c*–43*d*; chap. vi, pp. 103–29, to A, foll. 244*a*–50*b*; chap. vii, pp. 131–44 is omitted; chap. viii, pp. 145–76, to A, foll. 251*a*–57*b*; chap. ix, pp. 176–80, is omitted; pp. 180–98 (missing in A) to R, foll. 265*b*–69*d*; chap. x, pp. 198–218 (partly missing in A) to R, foll. 270*b*–76*c*; chap. xi, pp. 219–23, to A, foll. 282*b*–93*c*; chap. xii, pp. 233–43 (not in A) to R, foll. 311*b*–13*c*; pp. 243–47, to A, foll. 305*a*, *b*, *c*, *d*, line 18; R, foll. 313*c*, line 26, to foll. 314*c*, line 4.

is to be found who is to supply the hangings of the sword. But apparently, with a view to avoid contradiction, the information found in *G.-D. Quest*, that she is Pellinor's daughter, is suppressed altogether in *G.-T. Quest*. The inclusion of the Cayphas episode in *G.-T. Quest* as found in *G.-D. Quest* is another example, and so is the account of Lancelot's visit to Corbenic.

Entirely different from both versions is the account in *G.-T. Quest* of the arrival of the grail-questers in Corbenic, as well as the principal act of the whole quest, the beholding of the holy vessel and the lance and the healing of the maimed king who is many times not named at all, but is mostly called Pelles.

It would greatly transcend the limits of this present article if I were to enter into further details. When the trilogy-quest as represented by the Portuguese MS No. 2295 is accessible in a printed edition, a comparison of the three versions of the quest will form an interesting and fruitful subject for a dissertation. Moreover, a comparison of Løseth's brief account, §§ 504–10, 516–32, and 563–65, etc., with *G.-L. Quest* will present a fair idea of the relationship in which *G.-T. Quest* stands to it.

But, while about twenty pages of *G.-L. Quest* are not in *G.-T. Quest*, there are about sixty-two leaves of four columns each in A absent from *G.-L. Quest*.

In A *G.-T. Quest* fills 161 leaves, viz., foll. 164–306, to which have to be added the 19 leaves missing after foll. 205*d* and 266*d*. Out of the 161 leaves, 62 represent matter not found in *G.-L. Quest*. Therefore 247 minus 20 printed pages are equal to 161 minus 62 written leaves, which would in type fill 139 pages. In other words, if *G.-T. Quest* were printed in the same style as the edition of Roxburghe Club, it would fill 220 plus 139, or about 359 pages.

From A, fol. 178*a*, to the end we have in E (Egerton, 989) a third MS of the same text as A and R.

The quest begins in A, fol. 164*b*, line 24, thus:

> Chi endroit dist li contes que si grans honours & si grans glorie uint adont en la chite de camaalot que nus ne fust a cele feste pour tant quil uest les cheualiers les dames & les damoiseles & les puceles qui a cele feste estoient uenues quil nel tenist a grant merueille, etc.

The incident with which *G.-L. Quest* begins is told on fol. 165*a*, lines 36 ff.

Sir Tristran's adventures in the quest begin on fol. 178*a*, and this corresponds to E, fol. 1, running thus:

Or dit le compte et la vraye Hystoire du saint greal le deuise que quant messire tristan de lionnoys se fu party de ses compaignons de la table Ronde qui la queste du saint greal auoient juree, etc.

In six places *G.-T. Quest* has insertions in verse; they are always in sections not found in *G.-L. Quest.* In A, fol. 166*c*: "A toi rois artus qui seigneur;" fol. 167*d*: "Riens nest qui ne viegne a sa fin;" fol. 179*b*: "Amors de uostre acordement;" fol. 192*b*: "A vous tristran amis verai;" fol. 214*b*: "Apres che que iou eu victoire;"[1] fol. 214*d*: "La ou iou fui dedens la mer;" and 287*c*: "Damours vienent mi chant & mi plour."

The death of Sir Tristran by stabbing from behind is told in A, foll. 290–92; R, foll. 299, 300; E, foll. 422, 423. After this nine sections or *laisses* follow in the MSS, being almost exclusively borrowed from *G.-D. Quest*, as it is found partly in MSS fr. Nos. 112 and 351, more completely in the Spanish *Demanda*, and entirely in the Portuguese *Demanda.* These are as follows:

1. Lament of King Mark, burial of Tristran and Iseult at Tintagel; Sagremor's departure with Tristran's arms toward Cameloth: A, 292*d;* R, 301*b;* E, 423 *recto.*

2. Adventures of Galahad and Lancelot: A, 293*b;* R, 302*a;* E, 425 *recto.*

[1] As an example of style I give this passage in full:

Apres che que iou eu victoire
fis si grant ualour en estoire
amors si me met en tel gloire
Mon lay fais & met en memoire.

Damours meuf mes lays mes uers
se amours ma este diuers
& en este & en yuer
or ne ma pas este paruers.

Que iou ai longement geu
en dolour & trauail eu
pour chou si uoeil que soit seu
comment amours mont esmeu.

Se iou disoie la bonte
damours iou seroie a honte
pour chou uoeil iou que soit conte
en quel pris amours mont monte.

Amours ma tenu longement
en doeul en ire & en tourment
Mais ore ai iou souagement
amende ma fait largement.

Quant entre la flour des mortex
Me mist amors que iou fui tex
Mieudres ne fu ne autreteus
pour cou di iou camors est diex.

Quant a louuereps oi le pris
que tous li mons auoit eu pris
que iou i fui au meillour pris
& il i furent tout mespris.

Bien doi damors estre auoes
por tant sui par amors loes
hay uous chi qui mon dit oes
amours de tout en tout ames.

Quant amours se ueut entremetre
qui ma fait ensi grant pris metre
que encor sera mis en lettre
del tout me doi a lui sousmetre.

3. Adventures of Galahad, Boors, and Perceval before the castle of La Marche and the knighting of Samaliel: A, 294*c*, R, 303*c*; E, 426 *verso*.

4. Adventures of Samaliel and Kay the seneschal: A, 297*b*; R, 306*c*; E, 434 *verso*.

5. Adventures of Lancelot in a boat and his arrival at the Palace of the Grail: A, 299*a*; R, 308*a*; E, 438 *recto*.

6. Palamedes christened and made knight of the Round Table, followed by the adventures of Galahad, Boors, and Perceval, with an account of the Grail (this latter, A, 301*d*, line 12, to 303*a*, line 13, neither in R nor in E): A, 301*b*; R, 310*d*; E, 444 *recto*.

7. Encounter of Palamedes and Lancelot and slaying of Palamedes by Gavain and Agravain: A, 303*a*; not in R; E, 453 *verso*.

8. Arrival of Galahad, Boors, and Perceval at Sarras and death of Galahad and Perceval: A, 305*a*; R, 313*c*; E, 459 *recto*.

The contents of R, 314*c*, ll. 5–31, are not in A and E, and are here given:

Qant boort uit quil estoit tout seul remeis en si lontaigne terre comme epairie de babiloine il se parti de saraz touz armes & uint a la mer & entra en vne nef & li auint si bien que en poi de tens uint el roiaume de logres quant il fu el pais si cheuaucha tant quil uint a kamaalot ou li rois artus estoit si ne fu onques fet si grant ioie comme tuit cil de la cort li firent que bien le cuidoient auoir perdu a toz ior mes por ce que si longement auoit este hors del pais quant il orent mangie li rois fist uenir auant li clers qui les auentures as cheualiers de laienz metoient en escrit quant boort ot conte lauenture del saint graal teles comme ele estoient auenues ele furent mises en escrit (&) gardees en lamore de salibieres dont mestre galtier map les trest a fere son liure du saint graal por lamor du roi herri son sengnor qui fist lastoire tralater del latin en romanz si se test atant li contes a parler del roi artus que plus ne dist a ceste foiz & retorne a parle(r) de sagremorz comment il uint a cort & aporta les armes tristrans.

9. News of the death of Palamedes told to Sagremor and comment on his own news relative to the death of Tristran: A, fol. 305*d*; R, fol. 314*c*; E, fol. 462 *recto*.

On foll. 464 *verso* and 465 *recto* occurs in E the paragraph found in many *Lancelot* MSS, preceding the *Morte Artus*:

Quant messire boord fut Reuenu a court assez trouua qui honnour lui firent. car moult le desiroient a veoir tous et toutes . Et quant il leur

ot compte la mort de galaad et de parceual chacuns en fist duel moult grant mais Reconforter leur en conuient . Et lors fist le Roy mectre en escript toutes les auantures et merueilles que les compaignons de la table Ronde auoient fetes en la queste del saint greal, etc.

This is absent from both A and R. Immediately after this passage occurs in E an epilogue beginning:

Assez me suis trauaille de cestuy liure mectre a fin, etc.[1]

At the end, E has this colophon:

Cy fine listoire de messire tristan de leonnoys et de la royne ysut de coruouille et des fays de mains autres bons cheualiers du temps le roy arthus. Laquelle ystoire fut acheuee descripre le XXI^{er} jour doctobre le propre iour des XI^{m} vierges lan M iiii^{c} LXXV.

Considering that other MSS of the enlarged second part of the *Tristan*, or common version—belonging to the same group—contain a very similar epilogue, I incline to the belief that A and R also contained it; so that both MSS would in reality lack another leaf each at the end.

FROM THE "TRISTAN" MS ADD. 5474, FF. 142^{c}–164^{b} BRITISH MUSEUM

(Sir Thomas Mallory's *Le Morte Darthur*, Books XI and XII)

Part III (*Conclusion*)

Lors se departent de lor compaignes si sagement que nule ne sen apercoit. & uont tant que eles vienent la ou lancelot estoit & dormoit si lesgarderent grant pieche & dient que uous en samble & eles dient que mout est biaus si sasieent les lui & le commenchent a esgarder entre les .ii. asses longement. & la fille au roi pelles qui lesgardoit mout ententieuement & imetoit si son auis que ele counoist que cest lancelot. si est tant dolante que nule plus & tant lie que nule plus. si est lie de che que ele la trouue & dolante de cou que il est hors du sens. car bien counoist que cou est chil qui tant auoit repairiet a la maison son pere en guise dome foursene mais ele ne le uaut mie dire a sa compaignie que ce soit lancelot. ains le coile bien. si sen parti atant & uint a ses compaignes qui laloient querant parmi le iarding. lors lor dist que ele se sentoit un poi deshaitie & quele sen uoloit aler & celes font tantost son commandement. & quant la damoisele vint el palais si demanda ou ses peres estoit & on li enseigne & ele vient alui & le trait a vne part . & li dist. sire nouuieles uos aport merueilleuses. queles fait li rois dites les moi sire fait ele me sire lancelot du lac est chaiens . & si ne le sauons mie.

Haꝰ biele fille fait li rois que cest che que vous dites lancelot est mors piecha. si con iou ai oi dire as conpaignons de la table reonde qui le dient pour uoir. enondieu fait ele non est car ie lai maintenant ueu tout sain de ses menbres & uenes od moi ie le vous mousterrai. ore ialons dont fait li rois. lors sen entrent andoi el iarding saus plus de conpaignie & font tant quil vienent a la fontaine ou lancelot dormoit. & quant li rois est la venus si counoist que cest chil qui tant a repairiet a la cour en guise dome foursene. sire fait ele que uous en samble nest ce me sire lancelot. & il ne respont mie a chou ains lesgarde plus & plus . lors ne se pot plus taire ains souspire de cuer parfont si li chient les larmes des iex aual sa fache . & quant il parla si dist. diex quel damage lors dist a sa fille uoirement est chou chil qui vous disies [*fol. 158, col. b*] damoisele ore en alons nous de chi & iou imetrai tout le boin conseil que iou iporrai metre

Lors retorne li rois en son palais & desfent a sa fille quele ne die anului que che soit lancelot . & ele dist que non fera ele. & li rois prist .ii. escuiers & les maine iusqua la fontaine & lor mostre le fol & lor dist quil le prengent & li lient les pies & les mains puis enfera son plaisir & chil ont grant paor quil nel fache ochirre. & nepourquant pour che quil nosent son commandement desdire le prendent tout endormant. & cil quant il se fu esueillies se uaut escaper deuls. mais che ne pooit estre. car il estoient preu & fort si le prendent a force & lenportent a forche tout liie en vne chambre sous la tour. au soir quant il furent laiens couchie le fist li rois porter el palais auentureus & li laissierent tout seul sans conpaignie dautre gent. & bien pensoient que si tost comme il iseroit & il uerroit uenir le saint graal el palais il seroit garis & reuenroit en sa memore si auint tant ensi comme il le penserent . car quant li sains graaus vint illeuc si comme il soloit il reuint en son sens & en sa memore.

Al matin quant li iours aparut clers par les fenestres verrines dont il i auoit asses & lancelot se uit el palais ou il auoit autre fois ieu si sesmerueilla mout comment il i estoit uenus & plus sesmerueilla de cou quil se uit ensi liie comme il estoit & lors commencha a derompre les loiiens dont chil lauoient liiet. & quant il se vit deliure il vint as fenestres de laiens par deuers le iarding. la ou il ochist le serpent. si commencha a esgarder el iarding. & uit le roi & sa maisnie qui ia estoient leue & parloient daler el palais pour sauoir comment il estoit auenu a lancelot. car mout fuissent liet de sa garison se diex li uoloit aidier. lors dist a ses barons. ales ueoir comment il est auenu al sot car moult seroie lies de sa garison se diex li uoloit enuoier. & il lor ont fait entendre que chil qui laiens auoit este malades estoit li mieudres cheualiers du monde. & sil plaist anostre seignour que il soit garis iou le uous ferai counoistre.

Lors virrent al huis del palais si loeuurent & entrent ens & troeuent lancelot qui estoit apoies a vne des fenestres & esgardoit encore le

iarding. & quant il vit uenir le roi que il counissoit bien si descent des fenestres & uint encontre lui si salua le roi & li rois lui. sire fait li rois comment vous est [*fol. 158, col. c, verso*] il . sire fait il bien dieu merchi car iou sui sains & haities dieu merchi.

Lors trait lancelot le roi dune part & li dist sire pour dieu dites moi comment iou ving chi car iou ne sai quant ne en quel maniere. sire fait li rois iou le uous dirai. mais iai paour que uous nen soies plus couars. lors li commenche a dire comment il estoit uenus a corbenic si derues & si hors du sens que nus ne pooit durer deuant uous & si maigres & si nus que nus ne uous pooit counoistre & ensi i aues vous grant piece demoure. ne iamais ne vous eussons connu se ne fust ma fille qui uous trouua dormant deles vne fontaine. si le me uint dire. & quant iou oi ces nouuieles ien fui mout lies si alai maintenant a uous si uous fis prendre a nos escuiers & metre en cest palais ou iou pensoie bien que vous i trouueries sante si tost con li sains graaus uenroit sour uous. & il est ensi auenu dieu merchi con iou le pensoie. car uous estes garis or uous ai dit de uostre estre che que ie en sai si uous pri que vous nen soies courecies car dieu merchi bien uous est hui auenu selonc les auentures qui uous estoient auenues. si uous reconfortes desore mais & uous deduisies chaiens od nous & iou vous creant comme rois que iamais ne vous faurai de cose que iou puisse faire . ains vous abandonerai ma tere & mon auoir & la seignourie de mes homes si que uous porres faire uo uolente de mon roiaume ausi con iou meesmes.

Quant il ot che dit lancelot commenche a penser moult parfont & encline le chief uers tere & ne set que faire de ceste auenture. & quant il a grant piece pense si dist au roi. certes sire ceste auenture a este trop uilaine & maluaise amon oeus. mais toutes uois mest il bien auenu selonc le commencement. or uous pri iou pour dieu que uous me dites se nus de uostre maisnie ma conneu en ceste mescheance. ou iai este. certes fait li rois onques ne uous counut nus fors iou & ma fille seulement. sire fait il ce me plaist bien grans honors mest auenue quant il ne mont conneu ensi maluais estat con iou estoie. comment quil maient descouneu en la grant pouerte ou iou estoie iou sai bien que des ore mais me [*fol. 158, col. d, verso*] counistront il bien se iou demouroie od vous & pour che uous pri iou pour dieu & par amors que vous me conseillies selonc che que iou vous demanderai. voirs est que iou me sui tant mesfais ou roiaume de logres ou iou ai eu toutes les ioies & toutes les honors que poures cheualiers porroit auoir. or ni puis remanoir car li entrers mi est desfendus car iou ni puis iamais metre le piet sans congiet & pour ceste desfense sui iou tant dolant que iou menparti si sai bien que del courouc que ioi sui iou teus atournes commé uous aues ueu. car quant ioi perdu le roiaume de logres par qui iou men parti. mais puis quil est ensi que iou tout mon uiuant uoel remanoir en cest pais iou uoeil estre en .i. lieu si

loing de gent que nus ne mi sache fors que uous & uostre fille. ou iert che dont fait li rois. ciert fait il en vne ille de mer ou uos me uerres ueoir. mais ains que iou i aille uos pri iou que nus ne sache la uerite de moi que chil du roiaume de logres me tienent a perdu. & che porres uous faire legierement. car puis que ie serai en cest pais & que nus nel saura fors que vous & uostre fille ia neniara nul a qui iou me face counoistre. ensi me porrai bien celer en cest pais.

Certes fait li rois se uous o nous uolies remanoir si bien uous celerions que ia de vous ne seroit nouuiele. mais se uous o nous ne uoles remanoir mais eschieuer toute la compaignie de gent iou en prendrai tel conseil que bien uous deueroit soufire au mien ensiant. sire fait lancelot caiens ne remanroie iou en nule maniere. car iou sai bien que mi ami & li compaignon de la table reonde me querroient chi & aillours. si sai bien que iou ni serai mie longement. sire fait li rois puis que uous ne uoles remanoir od nous nos en penserons au miex que nous porrons si vous aseurrons que nous le ferons ensi con uous deuiseres se nous poons.

A cest mot failli li consaus deus[1] si se lieuent de la ou il sestoient assis. & li rois fist signe a chiaus qui od lui estoient uenu que il se traisissent arriere & il si fisent. lors prinst lancelot par la main & le conduist hors de laiens si lenmaine en vne chambre qui estoit iouste le palais & laisse lautre compaignie pour lui faire compaignie. celui qui le iour deuant auoit este nouiax [*fol. 159, col. a*] cheualier & qui li ot la robe dounee si commencha a regarder lancelot pour che que li rois li auoit moult loe si pense que en aucune maniere sara il qui il est & comment il a anon. sire fait il me dires uous vne cose que iou vous demanderai & sachies que iou nel demanderai pour nul mal. mais ien serai plus aaise tous les iours de ma vie se iou sauoie qui uous estes & uous pri[2] foi que vous deues adieu que uous le me dites & que uous deues a la riens que uous plus ames.

Quant lancelot ot que li cheualiers le coniure de la riens dont il est plus amalaise si en est trop dolans & respont au cheualier. certes sire cheualiers vous nestes mie courtois ne bien enseignies que saues uous ore sil me poise de che que uous maues dit & ie le uous dirai par tel eur que iamais ne vous amerai ains uous nuirai en tous les lieus ou iou porrai fors chaiens. sachies que iou sui li cheualiers mesfais & ai anon lancelot du lac. que uous mar veistes se ien vien en lieu pour ceste requeste que vous maues faite. or vous ai dit che que iou ne desisse a nul home se mout grant forche nel me fesist faire. lors li commencent li oeil a larmoier si deuint trop courechies.

Quant li cheualiers uit lancelot tant courechiet de che quil li ot demande si saienoilla deuant lui & li cria merchi a iointes mains & li dist tout maintenant ha sire pour dieu ne uous poist de che que iou

[1] Repeated in MS.

[2] ? "par la" omitted.

vous ai demande. se diex mait iou pensoie bien que uous esties lancelot si ne uous caut se iou en sai la uerite. car bien sachies que ia par moi ne sera descouuert che vous creant iou con loiaus cheualiers. & iou le uous pardoins fait lancelot puis que vous cest serment me creantes a tenir. ensi parole lancelot au cheualier & quant li rois entra el palais il encontra sa fille. si li dist bele fille lancelot est garis & reuenus en son sens. & il puis li conte comment lancelot le requist que il le mete en .i. lieu loing de gent. car il ne ueut mie estre conneus de ceus de la table reonde. & por che ueut il demourer od uous car il set bien que si compaignon sont entre en queste pour lui querre. haᵛ sire fait la damoisele de ceste cose que uous me dites uous sarai iou bien conseillier. chi pres a .ii. lieues a vn lieu mout biel en vne ille a vn castiel que on apiele le castiel bliant & si est li plus deliteus del monde. & se me sire lancelot iestoit il i porroit estre tos les iours du monde ains que on li seust. car il est si loing de gent que nus ni va se par auenture [*fol. 159, col. b*] non parfoi fait li rois or me souuient de tel lieu il est trop biaus a lancelot

Lors vint li rois a lancelot & li dist. sire por querre lieu loing de gent ne uous conuient il ia remuer. iou ai chi pres vne ille moie ou uous porres bien estre tant que uous seres el roiaume de logres & en cel lieu lo iou que uous soies & iou uous iferai souent compaignie & ares tant de bien con uous porres trouuer el roiaume de logres & en cel lieu lo iou que uous soies. sire fait lancelot & iou irai se uous uoles quant il sera anuitie sans nule compaignie fors de uous seulement car iou ne uoeil mie que nus mi sache. ains demourres fait li rois iusca demain au point du iour & iou arai fait le lieu aaisier entre chi & dont de toutes les coses dont il iert mestiers. & lancelot li otroie le remanoir iuscha dont. ensi demoura lancelot laiens si celeement que nus ne le sot. & li cheualier qui od le roi auoient este al matin li demandoient souuent qui li cheualiers auoit este. qui auoit este hors du sens. iou ne uous dirai mie son non fait li rois. car uous le sares asses a tans. mais tant sachies quil est li mieudres cheualiers del monde. & sachies vraiement quil men est mout grans honors auenue car il est garis en mon ostel. & quant chil oent quil nen aprendront plus il laissent la parole atant. cel iour fist li rois garnir le castiel de toutes les choses qui a cuer dome sont boines. & auoec che i fist metre tous les oisiaus & toutes les enuoiseures par coi cuers dome peust estre soustenus & longement maintenus.

Alendemain quant il fu aiourne se parti lancelot de corbenic. & li rois mena auoec lui iusca .x. cheualiers qui desore mais seront od lui tant quil sera en cel pais. & quant il furent la uenu il entrerent en vne nef si les passa outre uns marouniers. & quant lancelot fu uenus au castiel si le uit si bel & si delitaule de toutes coses que il dist que il ne sen queroit iamais partir. quant il uit la fille au roi qui illeuc estoit uenue il le traist a vne part & li dist damoisele il est uoirs que uous le

saues bien que uous maues tolus [*fol. 159, col. c, verso*] tous les biens & toutes les ioies que iou soloie auoir el roiaume de logres & bien saues par qui iou auoie eues tantes honours. faites moi vne bonte dont uous ne seres ia blasmee. sire fait ele par moi sans faille estes uous partis du roiaume de logres & par moi aues vous perdues les ioies & les ioliuetes de la table reonde pour coi ie ferai pour uous tant que ie vous uerrai en cest pais quanque uous me requerres ou soit ma mort ou soit ma vie. or dites fait ele quanquil vos plaira. car ie le ferai outreement. iou uous requier fait il que uous en ceste ille soies od moi & mi fachies compaignie tant que iou i demorrai & quant iou men irai se iou menuois si uous en porres aler se il uous plaist. certes sire fait ele si ferai ie mout uolentiers se il vous plaist. & mes peres le uieult.

Lors vint la damoisele au roi son pere & li dist che dont lancelot le requerroit. & quant li rois oi ceste requeste il dist a sa fille. damoisele otroies li . car uous ares plus grant honor de sa compaignie que se uous la refusies & cele li otroie & li rois dist pour lui faire compaignie mandera il par sen roiaume .xx. des plus bieles damoiseles que on porra trouuer & qui iamais ne sen partiront tant que sa fille i demeurt. si le fist li rois dedens .viii. iours si comme il auoit deuise. si que ains que li .viii. iour fuissent passe ot lancelot od lui iusca .x. cheualiers qui li firrent compaignie & la fille au roi ot iusca .xx. damoiseles hautes dames de grant lignage qui le seruoient & li castiaus qui estoit en lille estoit tant riches & tant biaus & si bien garnis de toutes coses quil ni faloit riens . si auint si bien a lancelot que nus ne li sauoit fors li rois & li cheualier & encore auoit il le creant daus que en nule maniere ne seroit daus encuses.

Ensi remest il laiens & li cheualier & les damoiseles qui le deduisoient & il aloit cascun ior ains quil beust ne mangast au chief de lille par deuers le royaume de logres & regardoit uers le pais ou ses cuers traioit del tout & quant il auoit grant pieche regarde les grans deduis quil i ot eus & ore en iert del tout eslongies & ostes si quil ni quidoit iamais recouurer si recommencoit vn doeul si merueilleus que nus ne le peust soufrir fors il tant seulement & il ne [*fol. 159, col. d, verso*] soufrist mie longement cele paine se che ne fust par amours & chou estoit grans alegemens a son cuer & mout li faisoit grant confort.

Quant lancelot ot demoure en lille iusca lentree dyuer & quant il uit quil ot du tout perdu le hantement de cheualerie il pensa quil feroit tel cose par coi chil du pais le uerroient ueoir ne ia nel counistroient. si dist au roi qui lestoit uenus ueoir sire iou uous pri que uous me fachies faire .i. escu car dautres armes a il chaiens a plente. & li rois li demande la maniere del escu & il li deuise tel comme il le uoloit auoir. quant cil du castiel le uirrent il sen esmerueillierent por che quil nauoient onques mais teil ueu. & sans faille il estoit li plus diuers que on seust adont el monde. car en mi lieu estoit plus noirs que meure & deles la boucle auoit

vne roine dargent & deuant li ot .i. cheualier a ienous issi comme il criast merchi daucun mesfait & chil de laiens qui uirrent lescu ne sauoient quele senefianche cestoit fors seulement li rois & sa fille . puis que li escus fu fais si con iou uous ai deuise lancelot le fist pendre a .i. pin qui estoit en lille & dilleuc auant vint cascun matin alescu faisant si grant doel que tout chil qui le ueoient sen esmerueilloient.

Lors prist .i. nain que li rois li ot laissie & li dist me saras tu a dire sil ara a piece tournoiement pres de chi. sire oil fait chil iusca .iiii. iors en ara vn a vn bas castiel qui est a demie lieue pres de chi ore iua fait lancelot. & quant li tournoiemens deuea assambler si ua par le tournoiement criant li cheualiers mesfais mande a tous chiaus qui uont querant pris de cheualerie que ia nus ne uerra en lille de ioie por querre iouste quil ne la truist tant con li cheualiers mesfais i sera & sil enia nul qui bataille uiegne querre il laura ia ni faura. ensi enuoia lancelot le nain au tournoiement. quant il i fu uenus & il ot dites ces nouuieles si le tinrent cil du pais a desdaing & disent quil liroient ueoir prochainement & si fisent il. mais nus niuint qui pour fol ne sen tenist. car il les outroit tous darmes. en poi deure conquist tous les cheualiers qui virrent de loing & de pres. nul nen ochioit pour tant quil se uausissent alui rendre. si enfu la renomee si grans par le pais que on ne parloit se de lui non & disoient que uoirement estoit che li merueillex cheualiers & li mieudres qui onques fust el pais.

En tel maniere demoura lancelot en lille de ioie [*fol. 160, col. a*] mais lille nestoit mie ensi apielee fors por les damoiseles qui iestoient auoec le roi pelles & auoec sa fille qui estoit en cele ille & faisoient le plus grant ioie del monde. ne ca ne feist si froit en iuer que cascune ne uenist cascun iour caroler entour le pin ou li escus estoit pendus & pour chou lapieloient chil du pais lille de ioie. mais atant laist ore li contes a parler de lancelot. & retourne a parler de percheual & de hestor qui uont par tout querrant lor ami lancelot du lac.

Or dist li contes que grant pieche ceuauchierent entre percheual & hestor par mainte terre estrange pour sauoir se ia auenture les menroit en lieu ou il peussent trouuer lancelot mais ensi lor auint que onques en lieu ne virrent ou on lor seust enseignier si en furent mout courechie. mais ainc pour chou ne laissierent lor uoie. si cheuauchierent ensamble maint yuer & maint este sans auenture trouuer qui fache a ramenteuoir en conte & tant quil virrent un ior a .ii. lieues de corbenic sour vne iauwe parfonde & roide & uoient en vne ille pres dilleuc .i. castiel biel & bien seant. il regarderent le castiel grant pieche qui mout seoit en biel lieu mais il ni uoient pont ne planche par ou on i peust passer. me sire hestor fait percheuaus sil ieust pont par ou on peust passer nous alissons a chele forterese pour sauoir qui imaint. car trop me samble li lieus biaus & iolis. par foi fait

hestor iou ne le puis mie ueoir legierement. car ceste iaue est grande & parfonde si porrions tout perir dedens se nous nauions pont ou nacele. or nous arestons chi pour sauoir se diex nous conseilleroit de passer outre. car se diex mait iou ne me mouuerai de chi deuant que iou saurai qui imaint.

Entrementres quil parloient ensi il uoient uers eus uenir vne damoisele qui saloit esbanoiant parmi la riuiere & portoit sour son puing un espreuier qui iert mout biaus si la saluerent au plus bielement que il porent & cele eus autressi. damoisele fait hestor si diex uous ait dites nous che que nous ne sauons mie. de coi fait ele. de che que nous uolons sauoir quel gent il maint lains. car nous le uaurions moult uolentiers sauoir. par foi fait ele che que ien sai uous dirai iou mout uolentiers. iou uous di quil maint la plus biele damoisele del monde & estraite de mout haut lignage. laiens a .i. cheualier. li [*fol. 160, col. b*] cheualiers est cascun iour a heure de prime sous cel arbre illeuc & fait si grant doeul que onques ne ui faire grignor & il iuait si acoustumeement que ia nul iour ni faura. & tant uous di iou sans faille que cest li mieudres cheualiers as armes & li plus hardis qui en cest pais soit. & bien est cose prouuee que cest li mieudres cheualiers du monde. car il ia passe .vi. ans quil vint en cest ille & i mist vne coustume que nus ni meist le pie se il ne fust li mieudres cheualiers del monde. si fist la coustume crier par tout cest pais uoles uos oir quele.

Che mande li cheualiers mesfais atous chiaus qui sont loing & pres quil ne faura ia de bataille a cheualier qui en lille viegne soit a prime ou soit anone & sil iuenoit en autre point il ne si conbatroit mie. si en i sont ia passe plus de .l. mais onques nus ne senparti qui ne fust outres ou conquis & nepourquant il est tant de boinares quil nen ocist nul. si les eust il tous ochis se il uausist. or men conuient aler fait ele si vous commant adieu. ha damoisele fait hestor dites nous chou que nous vous demanderons. uolentiers fait ele. dites nous se uous sauies qui chil cheualiers est. si mait diex fait ele ie ne sai fors tant que auenture lamena en cest pais hors[1] du sens. si fu garis chies le roi pescheour. lors vint en ceste ille si a puis esploitie si con iou uous ai dit.

Or nous en seignies fait percheuaus par ou nous porons aler au cheualier & v nous porrons passer. che vous dirai ie bien fait ele. par dela cele ille au pie de cele tour a vne nef que on amaine cha. si i entrent chil qui au cheualier se doiuent combatre. si les atent cascun iour des leure de prime iusca none & les passe outre quant auenture les a amenes. mais il ni passe que uns cheualiers ensamble. ore ales adieu damoisele car bien nous aues asseures[2] de che que nous demandions. & cele senpart atant lors dist percheuaus a hestor me sire hestor alons huimais herbergier

[1] MS "fors." [2] MS "asseues."

en aucun lieu & demain par matin uerrons chi. car iamais ne men partirai deuant che que iou saurai comment li cheualiers set ferir despee.

Atant se partent du* riuage*[1] &* uont* bien* vne lieue loins herbergier chies .i. cheualier qui manoit a lentree dune forest. au soir* quant il orent mangie lor demanda li cheualiers dont il estoient & il dient quil sont de la maison le roi artu & somes uenu en cest [*fol. 160, col. c, verso*] pais pour conbatre au cheualier de lille. si mait diex fait chil pour conbatre ne uous iloe iou mie a aler. car sil baast a ochirre cheualiers maint en eust ochis puis quil vint en lille. mais il nen ochist nul & si conquiert tous chiaus qui alui se conbatent. atant le laissierent ester en teil maniere iusqual matin. & quant il furent leue si lor dona li cheualiers boines armes pour chou que preudome li sambloient & que mestier en auoient. & quant il orent messe oie & .i. petit mangie li sires monta o eus & dist que il iroit ueoir la bataille si se partirent del ostel ensamble & ceuauchierent tant quil virrent a heure de prime la ou il trouuerent la nef. & le maroner. me sire hector fait percheuaus iou uous pri que uous ceste bataille motroies & il li otroie & li marouniers prent .i. cor diuoire si le met a sa bouche & le soune si haut que de bien loing le peust on oir. puis[2] dist a percheual quil entrast en la nef & il si fait & chille passe maintenant. & quant il sont outre uenu il le fait hors issir & li baille son cheual & ses armes & il senuait a chel arbre & garde a son harnois que riens ni faille. puis monta & atendi tant que li cheualiers fu issus hors du chastel armes mout richement dunes noires armes & fu montes sour vn noir cheual & tint lescu parmi les enarmes. & la ou il uoit le cheualier il li adreche le cheual. & chil autresi alui qui point nel doute. si sentrefierent si durement ache que li hauberc sont fort & serre que li archon des seles rompent. si sentrabatent en tel maniere atere que li uns ne puet gaber lautre. mais il ni demourerent gaires. car mout estoient uighereus. si se relieuent & traient les espees & sentredounent moult grans couls. mais mout souuent esgarde percheuaus lescu au cheualier pour chou quil iot painte vne roine & .i. cheualier qui deuant lui iert tout a genous. ensi con sil criast merchi. si est li escus mout biaus & si diuers conques cheualiers nauoit porte itel

Quant il orent commenchie la bataille si ni estoit nus qui uolontiers ne lesgardast. car tant estoient andoi[3] preu que nus ne peust trouuer lor pareus. si depiecent en poi deure lor armes & lor escus & lor hiaumes si durement que andoi sont de sanc couuert. & ce les maine a estre plus orguelleus li uns uers lautre. si dura tant [*fol. 160, col. d, verso*] la bataille que heure de none fu passee. lors sont andoi si traueillie que apaines se peuent il soustenir ains les couuient maugre eus reposer pour

[1] The right hand bottom corner of fol. 160 recto, being much worn, the words marked * are not easily legible.

[2] MS has "puist."

[3] Not easily readable in MS.

reprendre lor alaines qui lor estoient falies si se traient vn poi ensus li uns de lautre. & sentreregardent & quant il sont .i. poi repose percheuaus parole au cheualier & li dist.

Sire fait percheuaus la grant proeche que iou voi en vous meesmement a che que iou uoeille ou non mestuet demander uostre non. car se diex mait onques mais nacointai cheualier que uausisse ausi uolentiers counoistre comme vous & pour ce uous pri iou por dieu & par courtoisie que uous me dites uostre non. & comment vous estes apieles. sire cheualiers fait lancelot uous estes si preudom que iou ne le uos deueroie mie celer. or sachies que chil qui me counoissent mapielent le cheualier mesfait. & de che port iou si boines enseignes comme uous poes ueoir. or uous ai dit mon non. si uous pri que uous me dites le uostre & qui uous estes. & il li dist iou sui de la maison le roi artu si ai anon percheuax li galois & sui freres agloual.

Quant li cheualiers a qui percheuaus se conbatoit entent cele nouuiele si iete son escu a tere puis prist sespee & saienoilla deuant percheual & li dist sire cheualiers iou me tieng pour outre ne plus ne conbatrai a uous pus que vous estes de cel hostel. quant percheuaus uoit le cheualier deuant lui a ienous il ne li seufre mie longement ains lendrece & dist haꝛ cheualiers pour sire dieu que est chou que uous faites. mais li cheualiers osta son hiaume tantost & li dist sire tenes mespee car iou me tieng pour outre. & percheuaus le regarde & uoit quil plouroit mout durement si sesmerueille mout pour coi cest. haꝛ sire iou uous pri par la rien que vous plus ames que uous me dites uostre non. & chil respont tout en plourant tant maues coniure que iou le uous dirai. on mapiele lancelot du lac. haꝛ sire vous soies li tres bien venus car iou ne demandoie se uous non. car plus a de .ii. ans que iou ne uous cessai de querre. mais dieu merchi ore est ma queste finee puis que iou vous ai trouue saues uous qui cil cheualiers est qui la matent nenil uoir fait lancelot. chou est fait il hestor des mares uostre freres

Quant lancelot oi ceste parole il commencha a faire plus grant doeul que il nauoit fait deuant. si dist haꝛ biaus dous frere iou ne vous quidai iamais ueoir lors commande au marounier que il veist amener le [*fol. 161, col. a*] cheualier qui est ala riue. & quant hector fu passes en lille & il uit son frere il commencha aplourer de ioie & de pitie si lacole & baise & fisent luns alautre si grant ioie que plus grant ne uous porroit nus dire. lors issirent du castiel cheualier iusca .x. qui estoient viel home & en cele compaignie fu la bielle fille au roi pelles qui menoit auoec lui iusca .xii. damoiseles. & quant ele uoit hestor si li fist mout grant ioie. lors le mainent au castiel si le font desarmer. lors commencha la ioie laiens si grans que on ni oist mie dieu tounant.

Quant hestor connut la fille au roi pelles si li demanda nouuieles de galaad le fil lancelot & ele dist que Galaad estoit li plus biaus enfes

du monde. si est ia grans comme chil qui bien puet auoir .x. ans. si mait diex fait hestor iou le uerroie mout uolentiers. si le porres par tans ueoir fait ele car iou sai bien quil conuoiera son pere quant il de partira de chaiens. or me dites fait hestor comment uint lancelot en cest pais. il i uint fait ele si vieus & si hors du sens ca paines le peust on counoistre. mais si tost comme il aprocha du saint graal il fu garis si vint en cest ille pour che quil ni uoloit mie estre[1] conneus[1] si si est puis si bien celes que onques puis nus nel counut fors ie seulement & mes peres & uns siens nies. asses parlerent de cele cose iusca la nuit. a lendemain uint lancelot a hestor & hestor li dist. sire ma dame la roine uous mande si couuient que uous enuenes acourt. ce ne puet estre fait lancelot que iamais i aille car ele le me desfendi. iou vous creant fait hestor que ele uous mande & il dist que dont iroit il. mais atant laist ore li contes aparler de lancelot & de hestor & de percheual. & retorne aparler de boort & de lyonel.

Or dist li contes que boors & lyoniaus cheuaucierent moult lonc tans que il ne porent trouer lancelot lor cousin & tant que il virrent .i. soir a .i. castiel moult biel & mout riche qui estoit au roi brangore de gorre & il cheuaucierent tant que il virrent ala maistre fortereche lors furent apareilliet escuier & seriant qui lor tirrent lor estriers. quant boors & lyoniaus furent descendu de lor cheuaus il sen alerent amont el palais si trouuerent le roi brangoire qui lor vint a lencontre. & lors sen alerent [*fol. 161, col. b*] il tout .iii. ensamble & tant que li rois les maine a vne chambre si les fist tantost desarmer. & quant li rois counoist boort il le uait tantost acoler & baisier & li fait si grant ioie que plus ne puet & li demande dont il vient & que il va querant. & boors li dist. sire nous alons querant mon seignor lancelot mon cousin qui est perdus si que on ne set quil est deuenus. & lors dist li rois que cou est trop grans damages ala cheualerie & a la gent. & puis dist a lyonel que il soit li tres bien uenus & lioniaus li dist que diex li doinst boine auenture.

Si comme il parloient ensamble dunes coses & dautres atant es uous la fille au roi brangore si ricement uestue & apareillie que cestoit merueilles de lui ueoir. lors se lieue boors & tout li autre encontre lui. & si tost con la damoisele uoit boort ele le salue & boors li rent son salu moult courtoisement. puis sasiet la damoisele de les boort si li demande dunes coses & dautres & tant que ele li demande nouieles de lancelot comment il le fait & boors li dist que il nen set nules nouieles & que est il deuenus fait ele. si mait diex fait il il est perdus que on nen set ne uent ne uoie de lui. si mait diex fait ele ce poise moi. mais iai fiance en dieu que nous orrons nouieles de lui prochainement car li cuers le me dist. diex le uolle fait boors. atant vint vns ualles deuant le roi & li dist sire quant il uous plaira uous ires souper car il est tout prest & li rois

[1] Not readable in MS.

commande tantost ametre les tables & eles furent tout maintenant mises lors leuent li cheualier lor mains & puis sasient. si mangue lyoniaus auoec le roi & boors auoec la damoisele. & saienoille vns biaus ualles deuant boort si le fiert si noblement & si bel & si bien que boors sen esmerueille. & quant il orent mangie tout a loisir & les tables furent leuees si sasist boors les la damoisele & li demande qui estoit li ualles qui si noblement lauoit serui a la table & la damoisele li dist nel connissies vous pas. naie si mait diex fait boors. or sachies fait ele que chest uos fiex & li miex.

Lors baissa boors la teste si deuint tous honteus lors saienoille li ualles deuant lui & li dist sire naies pas honte de moi. car uostre [*fol. 161, col. c, verso*] lignages ne uous nares ia honte de moi se dieu plaist. quant boors entent le uallet. il li iete les bras au col si le baise mout doucement & li dist iou nai pas honte de uous ains en sui mout lies & mout ioians. mais iou ai honte dautre cose. lors le fait asseoir a ses pies. quant boors ot este grant pieche en pais il parole au roi & dist. sire ie uous pri & requier en tous guerredons que uous me dounes .i. don que iou uous demanderai & li rois li dist. demandes tout seurement uous lares outreement pour tant que laie en mon pooir. grans merchis fait boors iou uous demant que uous helinant mon fil laissies uenir od moi ala court le roi artu si le fera li rois cheualier & li rois li dist que che li plaist[1] bien.

Lors commenchierent aparler dunes coses & dautres tant quil fu heure de couchier. si salerent couchier en vne mout biele chambre. ou il ot fait .ii. mout riches lis. lors furent escuier & uallet apareilliet si les couchierent & apareillierent. li doi frere dormirent cele nuit moult aaise tant quil fu biaus iours & clers. lors vint li rois en la chambre ou boors dormoit & lioniax a grant compaignie de cheualiers. si dist que diex lor doinst boin iour & boine auenture. lors lor dist li rois. Signour il est a che uenu que uous vous en uoles aler sire font il que nous ne poons demourer. lors demande helyant son fil & il i vint tantost trop bien apareillies comme ualles. si li ot li rois ses taions fait apareillier trop rices reubes si comme il couuient a cheualier nouuiel. & quant il furent apareillie il monterent sour lor cheuaus & puis prisent congiet au roi & ala damoisele & a tous ceus de laiens & il le commandent tout a dieu. mais moult prie la dame a boort que il prenge garde de son fil & il dist quil ne len conuient mie proier. car il en fera autant comme peres doit faire de son enfant.

Lors se partent li un & li*[2] autre plourant & larmoiant* pour la grant amor que il auoient* li* un* al* autre & li rois sen retorne en son palais* auoec* sa fille & boors & lyoniaus ceuauchierent* tant* de* iournees quil virrent a camaalot a* vn* vendredi*. mais onques ne

[1] Partly effaced in MS.

[2] Words marked * are not at all or only partly readable in MS.

ueistes teil ioie faire* con* fait* li rois artus & la roine genieure & tous* ceus* de laiens fisent a boort & a lyonel quant il* les* virrent* si demanda li rois* nouieles de* [*fol. 161, col. d, verso*] lancelot mais il nen sorent nules. lors furent cil de laiens tout esbahi si quil ne disent mot dune grant pieche. apres demanda li rois aboort quant il furent desarme qui chil ualles estoit qui auoec lui estoit uenus. & boors li dist sire a qui Quiel celai se iou nel uous celeroie mie. or sachies que cest mes fiex Quant li rois lot si en est tant lies que nus plus si li demande comment il a anon. & boors li dist quil a anon heliant le blanc & comment sire fait li rois est che nies le roi brangoire. sire oil fait boors. enondieu fait li rois il soit li tres bien uenus. si uous pri boort que uous & tot cil de ceste court uous apareillies a faire honor a helianant. car iou le uoeil faire cheualier diemenche au matin & boors & lioniaus len merchient mout. lors alerent mangier a grant ioie & a grant deduit. & quant il orent mangiet tout par loisir & les tables furent ostees si commenchierent aparler dunes coses & dautres tant que il fu heure de couchier si dormirent cele nuit mout aaise tant que li iors vint biaus & clers . lors se leuerent tuit si passerent cel ior & cele nuit a grant ioie & a grant deduit. quant vint au samedi au soir helyans fu baignies trop ricement & fu bien apareillies. & quant uint au soir il fu menes au moustier a saint estieuene pour proier a nostre seignour & a sa mere que diex li laisast en tel maniere parfurnir sa cheualerie que che fust alonor de dieu & du roi artu & du roiaume de logres. & quant il ot este en proieres toute la nuit iuscal matin il senala vn poi couchier tant que il fu grans iours. adont se leuerent tuit li cheualier & alerent au palais le roi

Quant li rois & si cheualier & si baron furent asamble el palais auoec le roi. boors & lyoniax amenerent helyant moult ricement. puis sen ist hors du palais & tuit li cheualiers apres lui si sen uont au moustier saint estieuene quant il virrent ala porte du moustier li rois sareste & fait uenir les sains & fait iurer helyant que il sera fiex & serians de sainte eglyse & se nus li uielt faire tort il li aidera a son pooir & se nule pucele & se nus cheualiers desconseillies ne nus hom a mestier de conseil uous le conseilleres a uo pooir si essaucheres cheualerie & destruires les maufaitors & les robeors. uous seres courtois & larges & de boinaires as desconseillies. uous seres droitouries & dires uerite en toutes coses vous ne feres uilonie a nul home ne a nule feme se che nestoit a droit uous ameres dieu de tout uostre pooir & moi qui uos faich cheualier si me tenres por uostre seignor des ore en auant & iou uous tenrai pour mon cheualier quant li rois atout che conte que [*fol. 162, col. a*] il conuient a cheualerie. helyans iure tout ensi comme il li a dit. lors sen entrent el mostier & font commencher la messe. & quant che vint au lire lepistle. li rois baudemagus cauche a helyant .i. de ses esperons & lyoniaus li caucha lautre & quant on lut leuangile li rois artus li cainst lespee & douna la

colee & li dist que diex le feist preudome. ensi demourerent al moustier tant que la messe fu toute cantee. si sen issirent adont du mostier li rois & tout si cheualier si sen alerent ou palais amont. & quant il virrent el palais & il furent assis li rois fist iurer a helyant la compaignie de la table reonde tout autreteil serment comme il fist quant il fu cheualiers nouuiaus . & lors sasient astables & mangierent a grant ioie & quant il orent mangie tout par loisir & les tables furent leuees si se deduisent li cheualier parmi la sale. en tel maniere con iou vous cont fu helyans fais cheualiers. mais atant laist ore li contes a parler de lui & retourne a parler de lancelot & de hestor des mares & de percheual.[1]

En ceste partie dist li contes que quant lancelot & si compaignon furent parti de la cort le roi pelles il alerent cerkant auentures par le roiaume de logres si errerent grant pieche sans auenture trouer qui a conter fache & tant cheuauchierent en teil maniere quil virrent a camaalot & quant il furent uenu a court & li rois les uit il fu si lies que nus plus. mais sour tous ceus qui en furent lie. enfu lie & ioieuse la roine genieure lors vint a court boors & lyoniaus. & quant il uirrent lancelot lor cousin il furent mout lie. si li dist boors. sire car parles a uostre cousin. & lancelot dist qui est chil qui est mes cousins. sire fait boors mes fiex helyans si li moustre. & lancelot li uait les bras tendus si lenbrache & li fait mout grant ioie. puis li demande qui le fist cheualier & il dist li rois artus. si li conte tout ensi con iou vous ai conte & lors li dist lancelot gardes que couardise ne soit herbergie en uous mais hardimens & proueche & il dist quil sera teus que ses lignages nara mie reproche [*fol. 162, col. b*] de lui & lancelot dist que diex li doinst proece hardiment & sauoir. quant lancelot & si compaignon furent desarme & repose. li rois fait aporter les sains & fait iurer a lancelot & a ses compaignons quil conteront la verite des auentures que il ont trouees que ia de mot nen mentiront & quant il ont iure lancelot conte son estre si con iou ai conte cha arriere.

Apres lancelot conta boors. & apres boort conta lyoniax apres lionel conta hestor & apres conta agloual & apres conta percheuaus & apres percheual conterent tout li autre cheualier qui en la queste de lancelot entrerent que onques de mot ni mentirent de cose que il eussent faite ne dauenture quil eussent trouuee. & quant il orent contees lor auentures lor proueches & lor hardimens li rois artus les fist metre en escrit a .i. sien clerc qui tous iours les i metoit. mais atant lais ore li contes a parler deus tous & retourne a parler du roi pelles & de sa fille

Or dist li contes que quant lancelot sen fu partis & li rois pelles uit que il sen fu ales il prist Galaad & le fist metre sour .i. palefroi mout rice si li baille en sa compaignie .ii. oiuenes cheualiers & .i. viel moult preudome & .xii. ualles pour lui seruir & de lauoir lor done

[1] Miniature No. 15: "Ensi comme lancelot parole a helain le fil boort & lacole."

asses si les commande tos adieu. mais au departir pleure mout fort. & pour cou quil ne pooit autrement estre si baise madame helaine son fil Galaad puis le baise li rois pelles ses taions. apres le baise eliazar qui estoit freres sa mere. Galaad les commande a dieu si cheuaucent tant entre lui & sa compaignie quil virrent en vne abeie de nonains dont labesse estoit sante si li fist mout grant ioie quant ele le connut & il demoura tant laiens quil fu grans damoisiaus & quil fu en laage de. xii. ans & de plus. lors fu tant biax tant preus & tant sages con nus hom de son eage peust estre & de les cele abeie ou il estoit auoit .i. hermite mout preudome & de sainte vie. si laloit Galaad mout souuent ueoir par le plaisir de nostre signour & li hermites counisoit lenfant par la bonte que diex li auoit donee & bien pensoit que che seroit grant cose de lui. si li dist vn iour apres vnes paskes. biaus fiex vous estes desore mais uenus a droit eage de receuoir lordene de cheualerie. dont ne seres uous cheualiers a ceste pentecouste. sire oil se dieu plaist dist Galaad car ensi le me dient mi maistre.

Or gardes dont fait li preudom que uos sores confes si que uous ientres tous nes & tous [*fol. 162, col. c*] espurgies des ordures du monde ains que vous receues lordene de cheualerie & il dist quil i enterra tex comme ili doit entrer se dieu plaist

Grant piece parlerent en teil maniere entraus .ii. ensamble. alendemain a heure de prime que li rois cachoit parmi la forest de camaalot auint cose que il vint illeuc oir messe a la capele a cel preudome. il apiela le roi artu & li dist. rois artus iou te di pour uoir & en confession que al ior de pentecouste qui vient sera cheualiers nouuiax cil qui les auentures du roiaume de logres metra afin & uaura cel iour aconplir le siege perilleus. or garde que tu semoingnes tous tes homes quil soiont a camaalot la vegille de pente couste pour ueoir les merueilles qui le iour auenrent. sire fait li rois me dites uous uoir. iou le uous di fait il loiaument comme prestres. & li rois dist que de ces nouieles est il moult lies. lors dist li preudom au roi. sire uoles uous que iou uous cont la samblanche du boin cheualier. certes fait li rois iou le desir mout & ie le uous dirai mout uolentiers fait li preudom

Merlins dist en sa prophesie que de la chambre au roi mehaignie istra la merueilleuse beste qui a merueilles sera regardee par le regne auentureus. car ele sera de toutes bestes la plus diuerse. car ele ara teste & regart de droit lyon. si ara uois de ioieuse dame uergoingneuse & si ara espaulles & cors dolifant a toutes fors coses soustenir. si ara cuer dachier dur & serre quil nara garde de flechir ne damolier si ara pense & talent de droit iugier. si iara rains & nombril de pucele uirgene & enterine. tele sera la beste merueilleuse si sera si fors. & si grans que les forces que deuant lui aront este serront niens qui verra lesfors de lui

Ore aues oi la senefianche de la merueilleuse beste si poes sauoir que ele samble lion a de uis. car il sera li plus fiers cheualiers del uis de

tous les autres. car nule beste na si fiere regardeure con li lyons. pour cou quil ara uois de dame uergoingneuse poes uous sauoir quil iert poi en paroles. & pour chou quil ara cors & espaulles dolifant que il iert de plus grant uigour de tous les autres. car nule beste nest si fors comme lolifans. pour chou quil ara cuer dachier dur & serre mest auis que a son hardiment ne se porroit nus apareillier [*fol. 162, col. d, verso*] & pour chou quil ara talent & pensee de droit iugeour dont il sera sans amour & sans haine. car il apartient a droit iugeour que il aint toutes les gens si quil les vns pour haine ne deport ne les autres pour amour. & pour chou quil ara rains & nonbril de pucele dont sera il uirges & castes teus sera chil qui de la lignie au roi mehaignie istera. & sachies que as soies proueches seront niens toutes les proueches de tous les preus. car il acomplira le siege pereillex de la table reonde. & menra afin les dolereuses auentures de la terre auentureuse

Ore aues oi rois artus de quele senefiance sera chil boins cheualiers. si mait diex fait li rois artus iou en sui moult lies si uous commanderai adieu. car iou men uoeil aler. a dieu soies uous commandes fait chil lors monte li rois sour son cheual & sa compaignie auoec lui. & senuait & demeure el bois iuscal soir. quant li rois fu uenus a camaalot il enuoia par le roiaume de logres & manda a tous ses barons & a tous ses cheualiers quil soient a court le iour de pentecouste. pour ueoir la plus grant court & la plus esforchie que il onques mais tenist. quant les nouuieles furent seues loing & pres si sesmurent de toutes pars por uenir acourt li baron & li cheualier si en ot maint assamble la uegille de pentecouste si que nus ne les ueist qui ne sen peust esmerueillier pour la grant cheualerie qui i estoit uenue & assamblee de toutes pars. si se taist ore li contes a parler deuls & retourne a parler de tristran de loenois.

Or dist li contes que tristran estoit en la ioieuse garde & de mouroit toutes uois auoec sa dame la roine yseult & estoit apareillies el tans paschor pour aler el roiaume de loenoys pour seiourner illeuc tout celui este. & la roine meesme si estoit bien acordee mais puis que tristran entendi que li rois semounoit ses homes & enuoioit ses lettres a tous chiaus qui de lui tenoient terre quil uenissent alui a camaalot au iour de pentecouste car il i tenra court la plus grant & la plus noble & la plus haute & la plus hounorable que il onques mais tenist anul iour de cest monde en la grant bertaingne.

Quant tristran oi la nouele il dist quil ne se moueroit de la grant bertaingne deuant ce quil aueroit ueue cele feste . & cele grant court & por ce remest il adont & dist que il iroit sans faille & nel lairoit en nule maniere que a cele feste ne fust. car [*fol. 163, col. a*] il pense bien que a cele court ara moult grant cheualerie & grant feste & pour ce dist tristran quil demourra encore el roiaume de logres pour estre a cele feste que li rois artus doit tenir. il demande a ma dame iseut se ele ueut aler acele feste ou toutes les dames de ualour & les damoiseles de lignage verront. sire fait ele sauue uostre grace iou nirai mie mais uous i poes bien aler se il uous plaist pour cou que conpains

estes de la table reonde. dame fait il[1] comment uous lairoie iou si loing de moi sire fait ele uous poes mout tost reuenir se il uous plaist. dame fait il puis que uous ni uoles uenir or sachies que iou nirai mie. sire fait ele si feres se il uous plaist & uos dirai pour coi iou uoeil que uous iaillies. ie ai tant oi parler de ceste court & a uous & a autrui que iou croi que ele sera la plus rice & la plus haute qui onques fust tenue el roiaume de logres. & bien sacies que tuit li conpaignon de la table reonde i seront que il nen remanra ia .i. seus qui uenir i puist qui ne viegne & quant il seront tout assamble a ceste feste[2] vos amis qui estes li mieudres de tous les autres ni esties auoec eus quen diroient il. il uous tenroient a maluais & diroient tout plainement que vous series recreans de bien faire por lamor de madame yseut il diroient que uous aries laissie toute cheualerie pour lamour de moi uous en series a hontes & iou enseroie deshounouree. si diroient tout mal de moi & honte de uous. ore esgardes sil est boin que vous eskieues cest blasme.

Dame fait tristran grans merchis de che que vous me faites connoistre lonor de moi miex que iou nel connoisse or sai iou bien que uos mames & pour ceste parole que vous maues dite irai iou ala cort sans faille. car iou sai bien que se iou ni estoie au iour que il seront tout assamble a la cort le roi artu li plusor diroient uilounie de moi & vous en blasmeroient & pour cest cri abatre irai iou la & reuenrai tost se dieu plaist. car pus que iou serai demain partis de uous iou ne porrai por nule auenture du monde auoir bien ne ioie deuant icele heure que iou serai reuenus a uous. sire fait ele ie le croi bien vous moueres quant il vous plaira & uos sares quil en iert tans & il dist quil mouera venredi ou ieusdi ne mencaut mais que iou soie le iour de pentecouste a camaalot. sire fait ele il mest auis se uous atendes tant que uous ne porres mie la uenir a tans. car iusques a camaalot a .iiii. boines iournees ce dient cil de cest pais. dame fait il or ne vous esmaies iou demorrai [*fol. 163, col. b*] iusca el tans que iou vous di & si iuenrai bien a tans a cel iour. car iou nirai pas armes fors de mespee & de mon glaiue ne ne menrai auoec moi escuier nul. iou uoeil uenir entreus si soudainement quil en soient tout esbahi. iou uoel uenir a cele feste comme cheualiers auentureus.

Sire fait ele ore oi merueilles ia saues vous certainement que el roiaume de logres a maint cheualier qui sont uostre anemi que sil auenoit par auenture quil vous trouuaissent desarme il vous feroient tost anui se il pooient. bien puet estre dame fait il. car il ne puet estre que iou soie de tous ames. car maint cheualier ai outre puis que iou ving el roiaume de logres qui encore ne mainment mie. ne iou ne sui li plus ames ne iou sui li plus hais de tous ceus de cest monde. or sachies que iou i uoeil aler en tel maniere comme iou vous ai dit & tous desarmes fors que despee & naies doute que de ceste uoie ne me puet uenir se bien non. li cuers le me dist. sire fait ele diex le uoeille.

Atant definent lor parlement. tristran demeure o sa dame tant con li plaist. & quant il uoit quil ne puet plus demourer & que cheuauchier li conuient sil ueut uenir a la feste si prent congiet a sa dame & monte si se part de la ioieuse garde & il estoit si bien montes que entout le roiaume de logres ne peust on adonc trouer .iiii. meillours cheuaus du sien. tristran se part tous seus de la ioieuse garde & ne maine auoec lui nule compaigne & mout se

[1] Not in MS. [2] MS "se vous;" compare fol. 142, col. c, verso, l. 4 from bottom.

haste de ceuauchier si li auint une merueilleuse auenture que il encontra en vne plaine palamedes arme de toutes armes. quant palamedes uoit tristran lome del monde que il plus haoit il li uint alencontre au ferir des esperons. or li est il bien auis que or puet il bien ochirre tristran se il ueut car tristran est tous desarmes fors descu & de lanche & despee si se muet auenir uers lui pour lui ochirre sans nul respit prendre. & tristran uoit palamedes qui ensi liuient a lencontre si abrieueement. li cuers li dist tantost que cestoit palamedes. & palamedes li escrie de mout loing certes tristran vous estes mors quant de mes mains escaperes iamais ne ferres coup despee. or uous ai trouue apoint

Quant tristran ot ceste nouele il sareste tout errant car bien set que cest palamedes li hom del monde qui plus le haoit. lors se pourpense tristran & dist que ferai iou encontre lui ne me pus iou desfendre che uoi [*fol. 163, col. c, verso*] iou bien & se iou me desfent ma desfense ni uaura riens car trop est preus palamedes. palamedes deuant che auoit abatu .i. cheualier & naure trop malement & encore gisoit li cheualiers illeuc tristran cou dist palamedes tu ies hounis tes daars iours est uenus. palamedes che dist tristran or sai iou bien que de toi nai iou garde. iou nai mie paour de toi se diex mait. pour chou se tu ies armes me quides tu espoenter par tes paroles nenil iou ne sui mie enfes qui sespoente de legier iou sui tristran qui hui en cest iour te honira plus uieument que hom fust onques mais honis car tous soies tu armes & iou desarmes si ne porras tu durer encontre moi. iou te conquerrai alounor de moi & tu mourras chi ahonte. or te garde de moi. car tu me lairas les armes se iou puis.

Quant il a dite ceste parole il ni areste plus ains laist courre a palamedes le glaiue abaissie bruiant comme esfoudres & le fiert si durement en son uenir quil fait le glaiue uoler en pieches. mais de la sele ne le remue. car de grant force estoit palamedes & moult ceuauchoit bien. il ne se remue pour tristran ne ne fait nul samblant quil se uoeille reuengier. quant tristran uoit palamedes il esgarde le sanlant quil faisoit & il uoit quil ne se remue il quide quil soit esbahis. si li dist palamedes comment test. ies tu mors. test li cuers faillis quant enuers moi ne toses desfendre. palamedes respont en sourriant tristran or uoi iou bien que tu asotes cascun iour. tu ies ore plus fox que anten. palamedes fait tristran sui iou fox. & iou puis bien dire de toi que tu ies li plus fols & li plus maluais couars & plus faillis que tu ne soloies tu ne toses de moi desfendre ce uoi iou bien

Tristran ce dist palamedes. quides tu ore que iou te laisse a asaillir pour paour que iou aie de toi. nenil che saches tu bien. tu ses bien quel renomee & quel los de cheualerie iou ai eue iuscachi de tous ceus qui me con noissent & se iou ore endroit por poi de cose perdoie le los que iou ai conquis iou aroie mal esploitie. or me di se diex tait uerite de che que iou te demanderai. uolentiers certes fait tristran se cou est cose que iou te doiue dire. se tu fuisses armes si con iou sui & tu trouuaisses vn tien anemi desarme & desgarni se diex te doinst boine auenture lasauroies tu en tel maniere ou tu len lairoies aler [*fol. 163, col. d, verso*] or me di que tu en feroies. palamedes ce dist tristran or uoi iou bien a coi tu bees quant tu me demandes que iou feroie en vne itele auenture dun mien anemi. iou le te dirai tout maintenant.

saches que iou len laisseroie aler que autre cose nen feroie. car iou re porroie faire plus grant uieute que dassaillir mon anemi desarme & iou seroie armes. & se il tasailloit ce dist palamedes que li feroies tu. iou men departiroie au miex que iou porroie. car alui ne meteroie iou le main se ce nestoit pour lui garandir.

Tristran ce dist palamedes iou tai fait iugier pour moi tu meesmes gardes mounor. tu meesmes as parle comme loiaus cheualiers & sages & enseignies. si mas dit que iou doi faire de toi qui es mes anemis . saches ausi lenpensoie iou afaire ne autrement nel uoloie iou faire ne neusse fait se tu leusses dit autrement . tristran or saches tu bien que iou ne uoeil mie perdre lounor que iou ai conquise por toi honir de ta mort ne me uerroit mie si grans preus quil peust abatre la honte que iou iconquerroie. por ce te di iou que iou me uoeil ore soufrir de la grant haine que iou ai atoi . vne autre fois par auenture te trouerai en meiller point . se tu as ta lance brisie sour moi iou men souferrai atant acesti fois . car bien uengerai cest courouch . or ten pues aler quitement. mais se auenture tamaine une autre fois entre mes mains & tu estoies armes saches de uoir que li vns de nous .ii. imourroit.

Quant tristran entent la frankise que palamedes li fait. il li vient a moult grant merueille. il ne quidast iamais que il le feist en teil maniere car il set bien que palamedes le het morteument. & quant il la trouue en teil point si amesure il li vient amout grant merueille. tristran fait palamedes or saches que iou nel fai mie pour toi ne pour cose que iou taime ains le fai pour mounor garder. car iou ne me uauroie honir pour toi ne pour autre tant con iou me peusse garder. mais ore me di se diex te saut ou uas tu en teil maniere sans conpaignie & desarmes. certes dist tristran iou menuois a camaalot tant con iou pus hui en cest iour si con iou quit isont assamble tout li boin cheualier du monde crestien si mi couient estre demain pour che que tuit mi compaignon de la table reonde iseront. & pour cou que trop auoie demoure a uenir que iou ni peusse uenir apoint pour tant que iou la laisse armes. iuois iou ensi con iou [*fol. 164, col. a*] iuois pour estre a cele haute feste. certes ce dist palamedes il mest auis que chil ceuaus sour coi tu sies est mout traueillies si te dirai que tu feras chis cheuaus sour coi iou siec au mien ensiant est li mieudres & li plus fors & li plus legiers qui soit el roiaume de logres. li rois artus lamoit mout & le prisoit sour tous autres cheuaus. & iou le conquis auan & me conbati alui pour la conuoitise du cheual plus que pour autre cose. iaim mout cest cheual & moult lai esprouue & tant counois son grant pooir que iou sai bien uraiement que se nus cheuaus te doit porter ius[1]ca camaalot cis ti portera sans faille. si uoeil que nous descendons ambedui & se il te plaist tu prenderas mon cheual & iou prenderai le tien. tu feras mieus ceste besoingne du mien que du tien.

Quant tristran entent la[2] parole & il uoit la courtoisie que palamedes li fait il en deuint tous esbahis. il esgarde le cheual palamedes & puis le sien si li est bien auis que palamedes li die uoir. palamedes dist tristran. tu me

[1] MS has "us."

[2] After "la" is a gap large enough for one word; it appears that the space was left by the scribe of the MS. On fol. 143 verso, col. d, the corresponding passage runs: "quant tristran ot ceste parole."

fais tout esmerueillier des paroles que tu me dis. il mest auis que iou ne peusse estre si courtois uers toi comme tu ies uers moi. tristran dist palamedes. se tu nes courtois cest tes damages car il nest nus cors tant soit chetis & estrais de petit lignage se ausi haute cheualerie se fust herbergie en lui que toute courtoisie & toute frankise ne deust estre auoec. & quant tu ies si boins cheualiers con iou sai & tu nies bien courtois ta prouece est poure & eslongie de tous biens ne ne porroit bien definer. certes se toute courtoisie estoit perdue si la deueroies tu retrouuer pour la haute cheualerie qui est en toi. or monte si tenua atant & te souuiegne des paroles que iou tai dites.

Quant il sont andoi descendu tristran qui est tous esbahis de che quil ot & uoit que palamedes li offre & remue son harnois de sour son cheual & le met sor le sien & quant il est apareillies du monter il dist palamedes se diex me saut iou te haoie mout na mie granment mais tant ai ore ueu en toi que tu me fais entroublier la haine que iou auoie a toi. ensi con iou porroie mon ami merchier dune bonte iou ten merchi & menuois a court a ceste grant feste que li rois artus doit tenir. tout li boin cheualier du monde iseront che ma on conte & iou iuois pour ueoir les cheualiers qui iseront & croi uraiement que merueilleuses auentures auenront a ceste court. tristran ce dist palamedes. puis que nous deuons departir fai tant por moi que tu me salues le [*fol. 164, col. b*] roi artu quant tu le uerras & se li di que se iou ne fuisse tant enbesoignies de grant afaire iou ne laisaisse en nule maniere que a sa feste ne fuisse. mais iou sui tant enbesoingnies que iou ni puis aler. & mon seignor lancelot sour tous les autres le plus courtois le plus sage le plus de boinaire le miex parlant que on sache en tout le monde me salueras & li di que palamedes est tous siens pour faire a son pooir quanquil li uauroit commander. & mon seignor gaheriet le frere mon seignor Gauaine noublie pas que tu ne le me salues chil est preudom si con tu ses si le me salueras & li diras de par moi que iou sui tous siens bien le sache.

Atant se departent. palamedes sen tourne & tristran senuait le grant chemin tant comme il puet onques[1] cel iour ne cessa de poindre ne desperoner en tel maniere ne onques ne reposa par iour ne par nuit tant quil uint pres de la chite de chamaalot ou li rois artus tint si grant feste que de plus grant noi onques nus hom parler mais a tant laist ore li contes a parler de tristran & retorne aparler dune autre chose de ceus qui iestoient uenu ala feste de pentecouste.[2]

H. OSKAR SOMMER

ASTOLAT, CAMBERLEY
Surrey, England

[1] ? "cheuauchier" omitted.

[2] Now the scribe returns to his subject—i. e., *Le Roman de Tristran*—thus: "Chi endroit dist li contes que si grans honours & si grans gloire uint adont en la chite de camaalot que nus ne fust a cele feste pour tant quil uest les cheualiers les dames & les damoiseles & les purceles qui a cele feste estoient uenues quil nel tenist a grant merueille que uous diroie iou illeuc peust ueoir qui i fust rice atour de dames & de cheualiers," etc.

THREE ASTURIAN POEMS BY MARCELINO FLORES, BERNARDO ACEVEDO, AND TEODORO CUESTA

Among the several "regional" tongues of Spain, two have risen to positions of considerable literary importance: Catalan publications come out by scores every year,[1] and Galician books are fairly numerous.[2] But Bable has a much humbler standing; aside from scattered newspaper articles, its literature seems to be limited to a few poetic collections that will doubtless soon be out of print if they are not already in that vexatious condition. Under the circumstances, specimens of the Asturian dialect are rather hard to get hold of, and new ones are welcome additions to the present scanty supply. I have recently come across three, along with various other translations, in the works of a Catalan writer, Joaquim Rubió-Ors,[3] and print them here so as to make them more readily accessible to persons interested in the subject.

M. Flores

"*Canción de infancia*"

Mal apenes risca l día ya lu escurez noche negra:
I ansí a to frente, oi tan nidia, ceo arrugará la pena.
Solo l cariñu de madre ye siempre l mesmu ena tierra.
Añérate, mi alma, nel, como ena concha la perla.
Ofrecerat' esti mundu guapos caminos, mió neña,
Toos enllenos de flores con mas escayos que fueya.
¡ Ai de ti si l mió cariñu non cúida de to inocencia !
Añérate en el, mió vida, como ena concha la perla.
Com' una mariposina vas co les roses en fiesta;
¡ Ai si quiciáes mañana te dan les flores tristeza !
Ye que dexaste l cariñu q' oi a to ma la embelesa,
I non t' añeraste nel, como ena concha la perla.
Fuélgueste oi co les gallines gasayosina i contenta,
I mañana los galanes an de rondá la to puerta.
¡ Probe de ti si l cariñu de to ma por ti non vela !

[1] The last volume I have seen of the *Revista de bibliografia catalana* (1903) gives about a hundred titles.

[2] Carré, *La literatura gallega en el siglo XIX*, Coruña, 1903.

[3] *Lo Gayter del Llobregat*, Vol. II, pp. 201, 282, 315. Barcelona, 1889.

Añérate, fía, nel, como ena concha la perla.
Si l mundu tristeza ye, como el cielo e gloria eterna,
Pa que al cielo pueda dir sin pasar por lloru i pena,
Fai, Señor, q' esti anxelín en mió seno un cielo tenga
I que nel so ñeru faiga como ena concha la perla.

'B. Acevedo

"*Puesta de sol*"

¡Que grande ye, al morrer l' astro del día!
¡Cuandu, amanti, a la tierra dende l' adusta sierra
So besino postreru i dulce unvía,
Dulce i fríu, como beso d' angonía!
¡Cuandu so lluz, q' a la mirá n' ofiende,
Como polvu de grana verbena n la quintana,
I sub' al cielu i per uquier s' estiende
I coralinos d' oro n todu priende!
¡Que guapu ver les ñubes pintadines,
Del ventiquin en ales, esnala que t' esnales
Entornu al sol, que mat' a les probines
Como mata l candil les paxarines!
¡Que sele i mansiquino l mar de plata!
La barca fachendona co la vela picona
Inchá, vien cancia l puertu i fiende, ingrata,
L' espeyu n que sñidiandu se retrata.
¡I cuandu Dios alciend' allá n' asfera
Esquirpiáes d' estrelles q' asemeyan centelles,
Como si fiestes en el cielu hubiera
I nelles Dios ficiés bona foguera!
¡Cuandu n dulce quexíu les campanes
Dicen adiós al día, i la malanconía
Con que lloren a un tiempu les quintanes,
Bosques, ríus, regatus i fontanes!
Pero ¿pa qué, Señor, tanta guapeza
I alegría punxiste xunta la sombra triste?
¿Ye bien q' otru sol pida i apeteza
El mundu, o fora ya muncha grandeza?
Si cuantu muerr' nesta llamuerga scura,
Dend' el prob' al monarca, tien del duelu la marca,
¿Pa qué al morrer del sol la lluz mas pura
Pon el mundu tan guapa vestidura?
Pensaba nestu, cuandu misteriosa
La voz d' algún henchizo díxome: "si Dios fizo
"Que la muerte del sol fos tan grandiosa
'I todu se vistiés d' oru i de rosa,

"Fo perque, al veti nella, Dios quería
"Grabar en tu memoria q' el combate tien gloria,
"La sombra lluz, como la nueche día;
"Q' ai un sol en sin fin tras to angonía."

T. CUESTA

"*Vuelta a la poesía*"

Lo mesmo que l guerreru, q' apurre n cien batalles
Al enemigu intrépitu sablazos a fartar,
Fendía ve la llanza, que cuelga co les malles
I cúida nuevos triunfos mañana q' algamar;
Ansina yo gociosu, dimpués q' a Dios del cielu,
Como a la triste patria, en troves mil canté,
El arpa viendo mústiga, sin sones pa mi anelu,
Barruntos gayasperos con ella abandoné.
¿I como non facello . . . . triando mil llugares
Tan lloñe de la tierra u l sol lluciente vi,
Sin que la dulce fabla, morosinos cantares
La xente saborgara que s' afayaba allí?
¡Ai triste! con enoxu s' oíen les canciones
Que l alma, fe manando, unviaba l Criador,
I a so benditu nome, fríos los corazones,
Sin comprender so llengua fuxíen del cantor.
Entós el destrumentu pretome so tenrura
I fixe pa les neñes mas troves que n Abril
Del campu surten roses al besu de ñatura,
Mas ¡ai! nin una neña m' afalagó ente mil.
Corones, dicha, gloria . . . . selin se m' esnidiaba,
Como la mariposa que vemos revoltiar;
Llacéries m' ablucaben . . . . la gloria que soñaba
Mil utros l' algamaron nacíos pa gociar.
Empapiellé de pena ¡que muncho! non sabía
Que la mió triste gaita folgábeste n oír;
Al fin por mi una estrella nel cielu resplandía,
Mas nunca los miós güeyos la vieron rellucir.
Perdóname, mió reina . . . . pos a saber q' ufana
Miós troves escuchabes, ¡Juasús! cuantes, pa tí,
Iguás yo co l' ayuda de musa per galana
Anq' envidiosu l mundu fixés mofla de mi.
¿Los omes que m' importen? ¿A que pensar na gloria?
Tenga quien miós canciones escuche con amor,
Pos miániques, penosu, llevar debe al istoria
So nome, quien nel alma gafez sienta i dolor.
¡O neña melguerina! atendí a miós cantares;

La llama del poeta na frente siento arder,
I a so primer rellumu, en diches, los pesares
Que l alma atristayaron, trocáes podré ver.
Por ti otra vez el arpa descuelgo, q' amusgada
Del furruñosu clavu pingaba n un rincón,
Como l guerreru vólvi, al ruegu de so amada,
A reflundiar la llanza con fuelgu de lleón.
Na fabla de los ánxeles, miós cantos, xana bella,
Por gasayate solo de nuevo sonarán;
I tos güeyos, tormentu de la mas pura estrella,
Al ver llorar los miós, quiciáes llorarán.
Por ti non mas, al nome de patria dulce i santu,
Nel ara el sacru inciensu omilde quemaré,
I en imnu fervorosu al cielu irá mió cantu . . . .
Por ti, pa les zagales, nueves troves faré.
Como l galán que texe co les mas gayes flores
El ramu pa la neña a quien amor xuró,
Lo mesmo améstar quiero miós cánticos meyores,
I a tos plantes rendíu el don facete yo.
I si dacuando l géniu mió frente n si allugara
Como Petrarca, Tasso o Dante, que feliz
Me vieres rapacina, pos to nome trocara
Por el de Laura bella, Leonor o Beatriz.

E. H. Tuttle

New Haven, Conn.

CONCERNING SCHILLER'S TREATMENT OF FATE AND DRAMATIC GUILT IN HIS *BRAUT VON MESSINA*

The relation of this drama to Schiller's own ripest theory of human life and to the fate-drama of the Greeks has been the subject of considerable discussion since the work was completed in 1802. Critics have emphasized the poet's desertion of Shakspere and the adoption of the spirit of ancient tragedy, marked by the *Braut von Messina*. Schiller's own letter of September 9, 1802, to Körner, in which he says the play "lasse sich wirklich zu einer äschyleischen Tragödie an," and that of February 17, 1803, to Humboldt, in which he expresses the hope that his friend, who had always called him "the most modern of poets," may now recognize his claim to consideration as a modern who has really appropriated the spirit of the ancients, are stock arguments of those who see in the *Braut von Messina* a fate-drama like that of the Greek masters. We are reminded of Schiller's association with Goethe, the enthusiastic admirer of Greek civilization and especially of Greek art, and also of his independent investigation of Greek life and dramatic poetry, reflected in his own poetic confession of faith, *Die Götter Griechenlands*.

The two features of Schiller's play that have been most frequently traced to his acquaintance with and admiration of the Greeks are (1) the idea of fate and (2) the chorus. It is however true, as Ludwig Bellermann says,[1] that of all the extant dramas of the ancient Greeks but a single one, i. e., Sophocles' *Œdipus,* is dominated by the idea of fate. Fate (*Moira*) is in this single drama the sort of predestination that can by no conceivable act of the human will or shifting of human relations be avoided. The world is here in the clutch of forces that make or mar the lives of men, with no regard to the purity or the baseness of their intentions. It is a prearranged scheme of occurrences

[1] Cf. Bellermann's Introduction to the play in his edition of Schiller's works, Vol. V, p. 163.

precipitated by impersonal and personal agents, all of which are alike unconscious of releasing the springs of destiny that produce human history.

Now Bellermann points out that Schiller has by no means accepted without modification this view of *Moira* that dominates Sophocles' *Œdipus*.[1] He tells us the Greek poet saw that a world like that imagined in this drama excluded the possibility of moral guilt, of responsibility; and he arranged his plot accordingly, so that the hero in the innocence of his heart fulfils the oracle, wholly without consciousness of the awful nature of his acts. He adds that Schiller, while retaining the idea of predestination and inevitability, ascribed to his hero a certain moral guilt: Don Cesar is neither ignorant nor impassive; he smites his brother in fulfilment of a mysterious oracle, to be sure, but he does it under the stress of passion and, by willing the death of his own kinsman, incurs the responsibility of a conscious act. Bellermann concludes this part of his analysis by inferring that, while Schiller gained by uniting the Œdipean with the more modern conception of the world, in the way of a more human appeal to our sympathies, he lost much for our logical sense through the resulting inconsistency beween the old and the new.

The purpose of this paper is to examine somewhat closely the nature of *fate* and *tragic guilt*, as used by Schiller in his tragedy.

Professor Carruth published in 1902 in *Publications of the Modern Language Association*, Vol. III, pp. 103–24, an article entitled "Fate and Guilt in Schiller's *Die Braut von Messina*," which in the main supports by quotation from the drama itself the following view of the matter:

He is in harmony with Bellermann in finding that Schiller has admitted into his fate-drama a degree of responsibility for the tragic outcome foreign to Sophocles' *Œdipus*, which he generalizes as "the Greeks."[2] He finds the family of Messina, rather than any one member of it to be the hero of the play—a view which

[1] Cf. *loc. cit.*, pp. 164, 165.

[2] The extent to which the belief of the ancient Greeks in the dire effects of inherited tendency to sin and crime has been unwarrantably generalized, as identical with the spirit of Sophocles' unique drama, *Œdipus*, is interesting and worthy of careful attention on the part of critics.

tallies with that of the present writer. At variance with the views of Heskamp, Hoffmeister, and Bormann, he contends that actual moral guilt and its punishment are not the "essential theme" of the drama, supporting this contention by Isabella's lines, 2506–8:

> Dies alles
> Erleide ich schuldlos. Doch bei Ehren bleiben
> Die Orakel, und gerettet sind die Götter;

by confining to Don Cesar the application of the final words of the play:

> Das Leben ist der Güter höchstes nicht,
> Der Übel grösstes aber ist die Schuld;

and, finally, by pointing out that Don Cesar is the only one of the characters guilty of an overt crime, and that he is not the central personage of the action.

Carruth then urges that, in the absence of *moral guilt*, there may be some Aristotelian fault (Ἁμαρτία), "unwisdom, or indiscretion on the part of others which induces the catastrophe." He finds this fault clearly indicated in Don Manuel's secretive character throughout the first act, in the words of the chorus, ll. 954 f., in Isabella's words, ll. 1450 f., and in the words of her sons, ll. 1293–98. He points especially to the explicit outburst of Don Cesar, ll. 2410 f.:

> Und verflucht sei deine Heimlichkeit,
> Die all dies Grässliche verschuldet,

and concludes from these indications and from the additional evidence of a large number of passages throughout the play, containing the words *heimlich*, *Geheimnis*, *verhehlen*, *verschweigen*, *verbergen*, *Verstellung*, *verschleiert*, *Stille*, *dunkel verdacht* and others, that secrecy is not merely the dramatic guilt of the mother but the very atmosphere of the drama. The children have inherited from the mother through the ties of blood and the force of example the same secretive and furtive habit of mind and action. Carruth concludes, p. 112, that *secretiveness* is the dramatic guilt of the *Braut von Messina*.

An examination of the evidence submitted by him and careful scrutiny of the whole play in the light of it has convinced the present writer that, while *secretiveness* certainly has much to do

with shaping the tragic events of the plot, it is not equally clear that secretiveness is the sole ingredient of the dramatic guilt here treated by Schiller. The complementary fault of the house of Messina is, in the ancestry, *ruthless disregard for the rights of others and violent appropriation of the objects of one's likes, regardless of consequences.* The chorus exclaims, ll. 203–11:

> Warum ziehen wir mit rasendem Beginnen
> Unser Schwert für das fremde Geschlecht?
> Es hat an diesen Boden kein Recht.
>
> Auf dem Meerschiff ist es gekommen,
> Von der Sonne rötlichtem Untergang;
> Gastlich haben wir's aufgenommen
>
> (Unsre Väter, die Zeit ist lang),
> Und jetzt sehen wir uns als Knechte,
> Untertan diesem fremden Geschlechte;

implying that high-handed, Viking robbery has produced the present territorial and political condition of the country. The chorus is equally explicit concerning the old Prince, whose wife and children are the actors of the tragedy. His likeness to his ancestors, in impulsive disregard of all obstacles to the gratification of his own will, is called to mind by the chorus, ll. 961–69:

> Auch ein Raub war's, wie wir alle wissen,
> Der des alten Fürsten eh'liches Gemahl
> In ein frevelnd Ehebett gerissen,
> Denn sie war des Vaters Wahl.
> Und der Ahnherr schüttete im Zorne
> Grauenvoller Flüche schrecklichen Samen
> Auf das sündige Ehebett aus.
> Greueltaten ohne Namen,
> Schwarze Verbrechen verbirgt dies Haus.

Here we have, also, distinct hints of other family skeletons not likely to remain quiet in the traditional closet. For the chorus adds, ll. 970–75:

> Ja, es hat nicht gut begonnen,
> Glaubt mir, und es endet nicht gut;
> Denn gebüsst wird unter der Sonnen
> Jede Tat der verblendeten Wut.
> Es ist kein Zufall und blindes Los,
> Dass die Brüder sich wütend selbst zerstören.

This commentary throws a bright light upon the idea of fate (*Schicksal*) that dominates the play. It reveals the author of *Wallenstein*, convinced that we live in a world of such universal causation, as to admit of no accident or blind destiny. As Wallenstein himself says, *Tod* II, 3:

> Es gibt keinen Zufall;
> Und was uns blindes Ohngefähr nur dünkt,
> Gerade das steigt aus den tiefsten Quellen,

so Schiller, in his period of maturity, conceives man as living in a world regulated by law, to which every object in the universe, other than the human will, must yield absolute obedience. With Kant he still exempts the human will from the action of this law and thus vindicates for man through freedom of the will a certain microcosmic superiority to the world of cosmic regularity. He leaves, however, all human faculties other than the will under the sway of law. As in *Wallenstein* our attention is focused upon the play of the hero's will upon other human wills and upon circumstances, in the formation of that character, whose fatal weakness is the tragic element of the plot, so in the *Braut von Messina* our attention is called at the outset by the chorus to the hereditary nature of the fraternal hatred and strife that constitute the tragedy.

The queen knows very well the outbursts of anger that characterized her late husband and induced her to keep her own counsel and to avoid the disastrous results of opposition to his will. In requesting the old servant Diego to bring back now from the cloister her daughter, Beatrice, she says, ll. 108–11:

> Zu lange schon erstickt' ich der Natur
> Gewalt'ge Regung, weil noch über mich
> Ein fremder Wille herrisch waltete.

This was the same iron will that aggravated by stern repressive treatment the violent disposition inherited by the boys, Don Manuel and Don Cesar, from their father. For Isabella says, ll. 34–38:

> Zwar weil der Vater noch gefürchtet herrschte,
> Hielt er durch gleicher Strenge furchtbare
> Gerechtigkeit die heftig Brausenden im Zügel.
> Und unter Eines Joches Eisenschwere
> Bog er vereinend ihren starren Sinn;

and she continues, ll. 41–44:

> So hemmt' er zwar mit strengem Machtgebot
> Den rohen Ausbruch ihres wilden Triebs;
> Doch ungebessert in der tiefen Brust
> Liess er den Hass.

Her husband's unbending will and his savage sternness have forced the queen to adopt methods of secrecy, to preserve the life of their daughter. It is true that Schiller introduces here, in harmony with his purpose to suggest the spirit and movement of *Œdipus*, a double oracle, as apparent motivation of the father's cruel purpose to drown the child and of the mother's action in secreting her daughter, without formal vows, within the walls of a convenient cloister. But the violent temper, the selfishness, and the brutality of the ancestry of the Prince and of the Prince himself are made perfectly clear by the words of Isabella and of the chorus, already quoted. These traits of character are an ample motivation of the threatened and averted crime alluded to by Isabella, ll. 1325–29:

> Und ich ward Mutter einer Tochter;
> Der Vater aber gab den grausamen
> Befehl, die neugeborene alsbald
> Ins Meer zu werfen. Ich vereitelte
> Den blutigen Vorsatz und erhielt die Tochter
> Durch eines treuen Knechts verschwiegenen Dienst.

Initial fear of violence at the hands of her liege lord led the queen naturally enough to adopt a stealthy habit of mind and action, ll. 2080, 2081:

> Den Mann zu täuschen, den umsichtigsten
> Der Menschen.

We must recognize then in the unbridled passion, the wild outbursts of anger, and the stern inflexible will of the father of the house the cause of the secretiveness recognized by Carruth as the tragic guilt of the play. Both mother and sons have been influenced by this temper of the Prince to adopt furtive means to secure their ends. This appears especially in the older son, Don

Manuel. His habit of mind, acquired like that of his mother by bitter experience, is phrased by him in ll. 651–55:

> Geflügelt ist das Glück und schwer zu binden,
> Nur in verschlossener Lade wird's bewahrt.
> Das Schweigen ist zum Hüter ihm gesezt,
> Und rasch entfliegt es, wenn Geschwätzigkeit
> Voreilig wagt, die Decke zu erheben.

It appears also to a lesser degree in the more positive and aggressive characters Don Cesar and Beatrice, as the quotations presented by Carruth show.

But even Don Manuel acts at critical moments blindly, in instinctive obedience to the rash impulsiveness of his race. While not disposed to question Diego for light upon the past of his beloved, ll. 758, 759:

> Nie wagt' ich's, einer Neugier nachzugeben,
> Die mein verschwiegnes Glück gefährden konnte,

he spirits her away, with never a thought of possible danger, upon hearing of plans for her early return to her family, ll. 786–89.

> Kein Augenblick war zu verlieren, schnell
> War mein Entschluss gefasst und schnell vollstreckt.
> In dieser Nacht raubt' ich die Jungfrau weg
> Und brachte sie verborgen nach Messina.

We share the view of the chorus, expressed by way of rebuke to Don Manuel, ll. 790–94:

> Welch kühn verwegen räuberische Tat!
> —Verzeih', o Herr, die freie Tadelrede!
> Doch solches ist des weisern Alters Recht,
> Wenn sich die rasche Jugend kühn vergisst.

The brother's disposition to yield unquestioningly to blind impulse, and to grasp without hesitation whatever promises for the moment happiness or enjoyment, is shared in even greater measure by his sister Beatrice. To be sure she is troubled later, as he is not, by qualms of conscience, a feature quite in harmony with her sex and cloister breeding. She exclaims, for instance, ll. 1006–15:

Wo waren die Sinne?
Was hab' ich getan?
Ergriff mich betörend
Ein rasend Wahn?
Den Schleier entriss ich
Jungfräulicher Zucht,
Die Pforten durchbrach ich der Heiligenzelle!
Umstrickte mich blendend ein Zauber der Hölle?
Dem Manne folgt' ich,
Dem kühnen Entführer, in sträflicher Flucht.

The same ancestral impetuosity is the occasion of her conduct regretted by her in the words, ll. 1037–39:

Vergib, du Herrliche, die mich geboren,
Dass ich, vorgreifend den verhängten Stunden,
Mir eigenmächtig mein Geschick erkoren.

She follows her impulses, good or bad, without reflection. So, when she left the garden and entered the church against the explicit bidding of Don Manuel, ll. 1072–79:

Kalt ergriff mich das Entsetzen
Als ich in die nahe Kirche
Wagte meinen Fuss zu setzen:
Denn mich trieb's mit mächtigem Drang
Aus der Seele tiefsten Tiefen,
Als sie zu der Hora riefen,
Hinzuknien an heiliger Stätte,
Zu der Göttlichen zu flehen,
Nimmer konnt' ich widerstehen.

She confesses later to Don Manuel her impulsive disobedience, when she says, ll. 1891–99:

Die Begierde war zu mächtig.
Vergib mir! Ich gestand dir meinen Wunsch;
Doch plötzlich ernst und finster liessest du
Die Bitte fallen, und so schwieg auch ich.
Doch weiss ich nicht, welch bösen Sternes Macht
Mich trieb mit unbezwinglichem Gelüsten.
Des Herzens heissen Drang musst' ich vergnügen.
. . . . . .
Ich war dir ungehorsam und ich ging.

Similarly we see her rush precipitately almost into the very arms of Don Cesar, instead of into those of her supposed lover, ll. 1105–10.

These are, one and all, the passionate children of uncurbed desire, with whom love at first sight is a matter of course. We have noted this already in the case of Don Manuel and Beatrice; Don Cesar is more highly strung than the other two. He says of his first glimpse of her whom he loves, ll. 1541–43:

> Fremd war sie mir und innig doch vertraut,
> Und klar auf einmal fühlt' ich's in mir werden:
> Die ist es, oder keine sonst auf Erden.

The resistless rush of an imperious will that brooks no obstacle to its immediate fulfilment prompts Don Cesar's words to Beatrice, ll. 1144–50:

> Und dass ich fest sogleich den Zufall fasse
> Und mich verwahre vor des Dämons Neide,
> So red' ich dich vor diesen Zeugen allen
> Als meine Gattin an und reiche dir
> Zum Pfande des die ritterliche Rechte.
> Nicht forschen will ich, wer du bist—ich will
> Nur dich von dir; nichts frag' ich nach dem andern.

It also takes everything for granted and makes the speaker leave the side of his beloved abruptly, before there is time for a word of explanation that might have prevented the final catastrophe. This inherited impetuosity is, in the present instance and elsewhere repeatedly in the drama, the only thing that prevents such a revelation of the true state of the case, by a truthful reply to a natural question, as to render impossible the fatal issue of the action.

Even Isabella, the queen, has her own share of inherited or acquired wildness of temper that frets and fumes at delay. When she expects a reconciliation of her sons, she shows by her words to the elder statesmen of Messina that she is tired of their arguments and their opposition and looks now for obedience from a subject race, by no means the equal of her own. Cf. ll. 92–100:

Seid denn bereit, die Herrscher zu empfangen
Mit Ehrfurcht, wie's dem Untertanen ziemt.
Nur eure Pflicht zu leisten seid bedacht,
Fürs andere lasst uns andere gewähren.
Verderblich diesem Land und ihnen selbst
Verderbenbringend war der Söhne Streit;
Versöhnt, vereinigt sind sie mächtig g'nug,
Euch zu beschützen gegen eine Welt
Und Recht sich zu verschaffen—*gegen euch!*

She knows the history of the princely house and remembers the relation of their present state to the story of violent conquest, dispossession, and subjection that explains their control of Messina. She knows their subjects obey them, not because they will, but because they must. She warns her sons against the subject race, in her efforts to induce them to trust each other, rather than the men they have wronged. Cf. ll. 338–43:

Glaubet nimmermehr
Dass sie euch wohlgesinnt zum besten raten!
Wie könnten sie's von Herzen mit euch meinen,
Den Fremdlingen, dem eingedrungenen Stamm,
Der aus dem eignen Erbe sie vertrieben
Sich über sie die Herrschaft angemasst?

When she hears from Diego of the disappearance of her daughter from the cloister, she turns without further inquiry to her sons and urges them to rush away in blind pursuit of a hypothetical corsair. Cf. ll. 1623–27:

Ergreift
Die Waffen! Rüstet Schiffe aus! Durchforscht
Die ganze Küste! Durch alle Meere setzt
Dem Räuber nach! Erobert euch die Schwester!

Don Cesar reacts at once upon the impatient exhortation of the mother and hurries away without a word of inquiry, ll. 1629:

Leb' wohl! Zur Rache flieg' ich, zur Entdeckung.

And when Don Manuel, obedient to his cooler temper, asks for information as to name, place, etc., Isabella rebukes him with a renewed exhortation to haste, ll. 1633, 1635, 1637:

Eile! Frage nicht!
Fliege zur Tat! Des Bruders Beispiel folge!
Sieh meine Tränen, meine Todesangst!

Thus questions and answers are avoided that would otherwise have averted the tragic outcome of the play. When Don Cesar returns presently for a token by which to identify his sister, Don Manuel has heard from Diego's lips, ll. 1663–70, words that impel him to hasten away alone, to satisfy his doubts as to the relation of his sister to his bride, l. 1674:

> Folge mir nicht! Hinweg, mir folge niemand!

Beatrice has witnessed the violent energy of Don Cesar, when he proclaimed her to his following as his wife, and she warns her as yet unidentified brother against Don Cesar's fierce impulsiveness in the words, ll. 1878–80:

> Bei allen Heiligen des Himmels, meid' ihn!
> Begegne nicht dem heftig Stürmenden,
> Lass dich von ihm an diesem Ort nicht finden.

Don Cesar acts consistently the part of the unreasoning man of wild impulse, blinded by insane jealousy, when he stabs his brother to death, on finding Beatrice in the latter's arms. Cf. ll. 1901–5;

> Blendwerk der Hölle! Was? in seinen Armen!
> Giftvolle Schlange! Das ist deine Liebe!
> Deswegen logst du tückisch mir Versöhnung!
> O, eine edle Stimme Gottes war mein Hass!
> Fahre zur Hölle, falsche Schlangenseele!

The insane outburst of anguish and revenge, uttered by Isabella upon seeing the dead face of her son, before she knows who murdered him, in the words, ll. 2324–27:

> O Fluch der Hand, die diese Wunde grub!
> Fluch ihr, die den Verderblichen geboren,
> Der mir den Sohn erschlug! Fluch seinem ganzen
> Geschlecht

suggests that the violent disposition of the children is in part inherited from the mother. This inference is strengthened by her railings against heaven itself before discovering the tragic truth. Cf. ll. 2382–95:

Nicht zähmen will ich meine Zunge, laut,
Wie mir das Herz gebietet, will ich reden.
Warum besuchen wir die heil'gen Häuser
Und heben zu dem Himmel fromme Hände?
Gutmüt'ge Toren, was gewinnen wir
Mit unserm Glauben? So unmöglich ist's,
Die Götter, die hochwohnenden, zu treffen,
Als in den Mond mit einem Pfeil zu schiessen.
Vermauert ist dem Sterblichen die Zukunft,
Und kein Gebet durchbohrt den eh'rnen Himmel.
. . . . . .
Nicht Sinn ist in dem Buche der Natur.
Die Traumkunst träumt, und alle Zeichen trügen.

She does not listen to the remonstrance of the chorus, that warns her of the fearful presence of the gods she denies, ll. 2396–99. The argument is clinched by Isabella's really titanic revolt against heaven itself, upon learning the terrible truth. Cf. ll. 2492–97:

Was kümmert's mich noch, ob die Götter sich
Als Lügner zeigen, oder sich als wahr
Bestätigen? Mir haben sie das Ärgste
Getan. Trotz biet' ich ihnen, mich noch härter
Zu treffen, als sie trafen. Wer für nichts mehr
Zu zittern hat, der fürchtet sie nicht mehr.

She spurns the child of her own flesh in his moment of supreme agony, exclaiming bitterly, ll. 2498–2502:

Ermordet liegt mir der geliebte Sohn,
Und von dem lebenden scheid' ich mich selbst.
Er ist mein Sohn nicht. Einen Basilisken
Hab' ich erzeugt, genährt an meiner Brust,
Der mir den bessern Sohn zu Tode stach.

It is quite true that Isabella presently regrets these bitter and unjust words; cf. ll. 2661 ff.; but it is equally true that her use of them under the awful stress of the moment is entirely in accord with her character, as revealed elsewhere in the play. These are words that cannot be successfully recalled, when the mood is past that gave them birth. Addressed as they are to Don Cesar's sense of guilt and grief, they evoke a mood in his own stormy spirit, which breeds an unalterable resolve to slay himself, in order to share with his brother in death the equal regard and love of

his mother and his sister. This conclusion of the action, while by no means the result alone of Don Cesar's reaction upon the reproaches of his mother, is felt by the reader to be the only logical solution of the situation, in view of the impulsive nature of all the characters concerned.

In the light of the foregoing considerations, the following inferences seem inevitable:

a) The house of Messina has an aggressive, fighting ancestry, who had at some time conquered the people of the country and bent them to their will.

b) Violence of temper, disregard of consequences and of the rights of others, and rash impetuosity are qualities inherited by later members of the race in varying proportion from their fierce ancestry.

c) The father of Don Manuel and Don Cesar was himself a man of violence, who had disregarded the marriage relations of his own father, when selecting his wife; had by his stern, inexorable control of his household and by his fearful bursts of anger browbeaten his wife into a furtive habit of mind; and had aroused in his high-tempered sons by a policy of rigid suppression such a spirit of angry opposition, as greatly to aggravate the hostility of their personal relations.

d) Each of the three children of the prince had inherited in various degrees from this father a strong disposition to impulsive self-assertion, to passionate substitution of personal desire for calm reflection, and to habitual disregard of consequences.

e) Isabella, the queen, also had a noticeable tendency to act on the spur of the moment with little thought of the probable results of such action. She had contributed therefore by heredity and example to the nervous excitability and lack of self-control so eminently characteristic of the three children. Her constant fear of her husband and resulting habit of secretiveness were bound duly to influence the thought and action of her sons, especially of the more passive of the two, Don Manuel.

f) Schiller found in these conditions the means needed for constructing a drama on modern lines by the use of the symbols of the Œdipean drama. Fate is here, as surely as in *Wallenstein*,

the resultant of given hereditary tendencies in active combination with environment and free human will. The symbol of the oracular dreams brings the play into external harmony with its ancient prototype, the *Œdipus* of Sophocles; but it does not conceal from the attentive observer for an instant the fact that the tragic action is precipitated, not by the oracle, but by the characters of the direct and the indirect listeners to the oracle.

g) Carruth's view[1] that secretiveness is the dramatic guilt involved needs to be modified in this sense: Violent self-assertion and its corollary, emotional excess, are fundamental faults of the father and mother, transmitted by them to their children. In the head of the house they so prevailed as to produce in the wife and mother the secondary fault of secretiveness, communicated by her in lesser measure to the sons. Violent self-assertion and emotional excess are primary ingredients, while their product, secretiveness, is a secondary ingredient of the dramatic guilt in question. The human character, which in its savage ancestral form had crushed a foreign nationality by conquest and subjection, occasions in a later generation, when turned by circumstances against itself, the downfall of a princely house.[2]

STARR WILLARD CUTTING

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

[1] Held also by Eugen Kühnemann in his *Schiller* (München, 1905), pp. 555 f.

[2] The tragedy abounds in other passages similar to those quoted in the foregoing, and supporting more or less cogently the main contention of the present writer; cf. ll. 25, 33, 35, 36, 42, 49, 53–57, 145–49, 172–74, 194–96, 226–28, 253, 254, 420, 421; impulsive reconciliation: 467–524; Don Manuel's love at first sight: 704–8; 885–90, 893–945; the chorus' condemnation of Don Manuel's abduction of his bride: 955–58; Beatrice recalls the criminal record of the house of Messina: 1217–24; 1795, 1796, 1802–5; Don Cesar's recognition of his own guilt: 2520, 2521; 2556–59, 2731–47, 2825–38.

THE INDICATIVE IN AN UNREAL CONDITION

I winna yield to a braken-bush,
Nor yet will I unto a brier;
But I would yield to Earl Douglass,
Or Sir Hugh Montgomery, if he *was* here.

—*Battle of Otterburn*, version B, date unknown. See Sargent and Kittredge's *English and Scottish Popular Ballads*, p. 391.

If he *was* not a fool he would not suffer his business to be carried on by fools.—Pepys' *Diary*, July 12, 1667.

"Ah, brother," said Christian, "surely if I *was* right, he would now arise to help me."—Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress*[1] (1684), p. 194.

And, behold, she saw as if a broad parchment *was* opened before her.—*Ibid.*, p. 216.

Our heart oftentimes wakes when we sleep, and God can speak to that, either by words, by proverbs, or by signs and similitudes, as well as if one *was* awake.—*Ibid.*, p. 268.

It looks as if something *was* written thereon.—*Ibid.*, p. 284.

Beauty of the body, which is the woman's glory, seems to be now unequally bestowed and nature (or rather Providence) to lie under some scandal about it, as if it *was* given a woman for a snare to men.—Defoe's *Academy for Women* (1697).

If I *was* not angry, I would immediately cause thee to be put to death.—Cotton's *Translation of Montaigne's Essays* (1700), chap. lxviii.

If I *was* not more afraid of tiring than of scandalising your lordship, I could quote, etc.—Bolingbroke's *Letter*, 4 (before 1750).

What would be left to me, if I myself *was* the man who softened . . . . all the distinguishing colors of my life?—Burke's *Bristol Speech* (1774).

I suppose you would aim at him best of all, if he *was* out of sight.—Sheridan's *Rivals*, V, 3 (1775).

Was I in a desert, I would find out.—Sterne's *Sentimental Journey*, I, 85 (1778).

Was this the only point to be determined, there would not remain a moment's doubt.—Letter of George Washington (1778), published in *Harper's Monthly*, January, 1907, p. 289.

[1] Though Bunyan's syntax is based chiefly on the Authorized Version of 1611, this use of the indicative occurs neither in the Bible nor in Shakspere.

These citations show that *was* for *were* in an unreal condition is older than the date hitherto assigned. Mätzner[1] quotes Sheridan's *Rivals* (1775) as the first occurrence. Dr. Murray[2] pushes the date back only to Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress* (1684). Sweet[3] says: "In the colloquial language of the last [18th] century, there was a tendency to substitute *was* for *were* even in clauses of rejection," that is, in unreal conditions. This statement is not strong enough. The tendency to use the indicative instead of the subjunctive was by no means confined to colloquial language. Nor is it confined to colloquial language today, as the following quotations from nineteenth-century writers show:

If it *was* not completely ridiculous, it would be something worse.—Byron's Preface to *The Vision of Judgment.*

I would not have said this for the world, if I *was* not a little anxious about my own girl.—Bulwer's *Money*, 3, 2.

What should I be, if I *was* deaf to the poverty and sorrows of others?—Bulwer's *Alice*, 1, 1.

Being unaware that the letter is not in his possession, he will proceed with his exactions as if it *was.*—Poe's *Purloined Letter.*

Altogether, it seems as if there *was*n't any place for me in this world.—Letter of Sidney Lanier (see Mims's *Lanier*, p. 199).

Please read and answer this letter as though I *was* not President, but only a friend.—Letter of Lincoln to Grant, January 19, 1865.

Don't heed me any more than if I *was* a speaking machine.—Mr. Lorry in Dickens' *Tale of Two Cities*, chap. iv.

Sir, there is a villain at that Maypole that . . . . will marry your son to that young woman as certainly and surely as if he *was* the Archbishop of Canterbury himself.—Sim Tappertit in Dickens' *Barnaby Rudge*, chap. xxiv.

There's enough . . . . to pay for it, if it *was* a score of casks full.—Hugh, *ibid.*, chap. lii.

Do you suppose, if all this *was* true, that Mr. Haredale would be constantly away from home, as he is?—John Willet, *ibid.*, chap. liv.

[1] *Englische Grammatik*, II, 130.

[2] *Oxford Dictionary*, *s. v.* "be," p. 717.

[3] *Syntax*, § 2268.

How often, before I knew your trade, did I hear you talking of this as if it *was* a treat?—Hugh, *ibid.*, Vol. II, chap. xviii.

I wouldn't say much to him, master, if I *was* you.—Hugh, *ibid.*, Vol. II, chap. xix.

He'd write letters by the ream, if it *was* a capital offense.—Miss Trotwood in *David Copperfield*, Vol. II, chap. xxiii.

Now, you know, Copperfield, if I *was* Lord Chancellor we couldn't do this.—Traddles, *ibid.*, chap. xxxiii.

I feel as if I *was* doing wrong, though I am doing right.—Letter of Thackeray (see *Century Magazine*, Vol. LXVII, p. 504).

It would seem as if I *was* drunk, and not you.—Thackeray's *Virginians*, I, chap. x.

My servants said your negro man began to sing it in the kitchen as if he *was* a church organ.—*Ibid.*, I, chap. xxii.

She treats me as if I *was* a fool.—*Ibid.*, I, chap. xxxiv.

She keeps off from me as if I *was* a pestilence.—Thackeray's *Henry Esmond*, Book I, chap. xii.

I believe she would be glad if I *was* dead.—*Ibid.*, Book I, chap. xii.

If I *was* Cadogan, I would have a peerage for this day's work.—*Ibid.*, Book II, chap. xv.

Instantly it seems to him as if she removed herself from him infinitely and *was* a sacred precinct.—Emerson's *Essay on Love.*

If I *was* sure of thee . . . . I should never think again of trifles.—Emerson's *Essay on Friendship.*

It looks as if I *was* going to send you the first three chapters of my Grandfather.—Robert Louis Stevenson's *Vailima Letters*, II, p. 176 (August, 1896).

They hear of the death of people about their own age, or even younger, not as if it *was* a grisly warning, but with a simple child-like pleasure.—Robert Louis Stevenson's *Aes Triplex.*

If the present *was* happy, I should try to live in that.—Robert Hichens in *Harper's Bazaar*, February, 1906, p. 116.

I have spoken as if the changes referred to were made "in the lump," that is, as if the word-order *was* first settled in every respect.—Jespersen's *Progress in Language*, § 76.

Nor could any other local standard be substituted for that of London

without manifest danger—even if the acceptance of such a standard *was* possible.—Brander Matthews' *Parts of Speech*, p. 68.

But a dip into the *Century Dictionary* again revealed that a Scotchman had not waited for an American to use the word [preparedness], and that it had been employed by Bain, not even as though it *was* a novelty.—*Ibid.*, p. 154.

If all the year *was* summertime,
And all the aim of life
Was just to lilt on like a rhyme—
Then I would be your wife.

If life *was* all a summer fête, etc.
—Ella Wheeler Wilcox's "An Answer" (in *Poems of Passion*, p. 89).

Many will complain that I am settling myself firmly in that field of antiquity, as if there *was* no other.—Matthew Arnold's *Letters*,[1] I, p. 55 (December 12, 1855).

It poured all night as if the sky *was* coming down.—*Ibid.*, I, p. 310 (May 23, 1865).

If it *was* not for this consideration, the exaggerated language of all the English newspapers . . . . would be perfectly unaccountable.—*Ibid.*, I, p. 356 (October 24, 1865).

We have been fifteen years married, and it seems as if it *was* only last week.—*Ibid.*, I, p. 385 (June 10, 1866).

The whole feeling of this morning was as if I *was* looking at something quite unreal.—*Life and Letters of Dean Church*, p. 88.

The effect was as if he *was* working his own way.—*Ibid.*, p. 204.

I should feel more sympathy with Germany, if it *was* only a question of its being welded together.—*Ibid.*, p. 235.

If the Archbishop *was* so alarmed as to realise to himself the state of things, he might help us.—*Ibid.*, p. 337.

And so I began to feel as if the cloud *was* lifting.—*Ibid.*, p. 415.

I think if I *was* beginning again I should begin with a serious study of *Paracelsus*.—*Ibid.*, p. 415.

C. ALPHONSO SMITH

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA
Chapel Hill, N. C.

[1] The only two sources from which I have attempted to reproduce all of the occurrences of this idiom are Matthew Arnold's *Letters*, Vol. I, and the letters in the *Life and Letters of Dean Church*.

"CAPADOS," AND THE DATE OF *SIR GAWAYNE AND THE GREEN KNIGHT*

A word "capados" occurring twice in *Sir Gawayne and the Green Knight* has given some difficulty to Middle-English scholars. It is found in the description of the Green Knight:

> Fayre fannand fax vmbe-foldes his schulderes;
> A much berd as a busk ouer his brest henges,
> þat wyth his hiȝlich here, þat of his hed reches,
> Watȝ euesed al vmbe-torne, a-bof his elbowes,
> þat half his armes þer vnder were halched in þe wyse
> Of a kyngeȝ capados, þat closes his swyre,

and in the account of Gawain's preparations for his venture, where he steps on the carpet to receive his armor:

> Dubbed in a dublet of a dere tars,
> & syþen a crafty capados, closed aloft,
> þat wyth a bryȝt blaunner was bounden withinne.[1]

Sir Frederick Madden thought "its derivation is clear, from the French *cap-à-dos* and doubtless means a hood or close cap descending low on the neck."[2] Another explanation has been offered. In the French epic *Fierabras*, the hero:

> .I. cuir de Capadoce va en son dos jeter,
> Il fu blans comme nois, boin fu pour le serrer,
> Pardesus vest l'auberc qu'il ot fait d'or saffrer,[3]

and Viollet-le-Duc[4] rightly considers the "cuir de Capadoce" a part of the gambison. Tyrwhitt in a note[5] upon the "jambeux

[1] *Sir Gawayne and the Green Knight*, ll. 181-86, 571-73; cf. the description of the green-mantled giant in *Fled Bricrend*, "Und (sein Haar) auf ihm war die grosse buschige Krone einer Dorflinde, unter der eine Winterschafhürde, in der 30 Jährlinge Platz haben, Raum fände."—H. Zimmer, *Gött. gel. Anz.*, 1900, 386; cf., also, 384-86.

[2] *Sir Gawayne*, pp. 314, 315. F. Michel, *Critical Inquiry into the Scottish Language*, 1882, 92, has added nothing to the subject.

[3] *Fierabras*, 612-14; cf. 805; Provençal version, 1001, 1138; K. Hofmann, *Rom. Forsch.* I, 118; Caxton's *Charles the Grete*, ed. Herrtage, p. 63, cf. p. 58, 27-8.

[4] *Dict. du mobilier français*, VI, 85; cf. Joinville, *Hist. de St. Louis*, ed. Wailly, c. 52, "Getai un gambison en mon dos." On the gambaison, gambison, cf. V. Gay, *Glossaire arch.*, 757; A. Schultz, *Das höfische Leben zur Zeit der Minnesinger*, 2d ed., II, 38; V. Schirling, *Die Verteidigungswaffen im altfranzösichen Epos*, 49; S. Meyrick, *Archaeologia*, XIX, 210; Du Cange, *Observations sur Joinville, Glossarium*, VII, 350.

[5] Note to *C.T.*, 13,804.

of quirboilly" in Chaucer's *Tale of Sir Thopas*, cites passages from Froissart in which it is stated that the Saracens covered their shields with "cuir bouilli de Capadoce." F. J. Amours, accepting Viollet-le-Duc's explanation, and citing the passages of Froissart, concludes that the first of the passages cited from the Middle-English poem shows "that the capados is not a hood but a gambison reaching up to, and fitting close round, the neck. Like the snow-white garment that the knight in *Fierabras* wore under his hauberk, Sir Gawayn's gambison was doubtless of Cappadocian leather."[1] I hope to show that the *capados* must be a head-dress, and cannot be the gambison.

Madden no doubt conjectured the meaning of "hood" by a comparison with similar descriptions of dress in the poem. The *capados*, like the Green Knight's falling locks, protected the back of the neck; and the Green Knight, in order that Gawain may have a clear stroke:

> His longe louelych lokkeȝ he layd ouer his croun,
> Let þe naked nec to þe note schewe (ll. 419, 420);

and later, when it is his turn to return the blow, he bids Gawain,

> Halde þe now þe hyȝe gode, þat Arþur þe raȝt (l. 2297).

Like the *capados* the hood is lined with *blaunner:*

> A mere mantile abof, mensked with-inne,
> With pelure pured apert, þe pane ful clene,
> With blyþe blaunner ful bryȝt, & his hod boþe,
> þat watȝ laȝt fro his lokkeȝ, & layde on his schulderes
> (ll. 153–156);

> His surcoat semed hym wel, þat softe watȝ forred,
> & his hode of þat ilke henged on his schulder,
> Blande al of blaunner were boþe al aboute
> (ll. 1929–31; cf. ll. 878–81),

and is a separate garment, and not a part of the tight-fitting body-dress.

> Hent heȝly of his hode, & on a spere henged
> (l. 983; cf. l. 2297 *supra*).

This internal evidence is only corroborated by a study of mediaeval head-dresses.

[1] *Notes & Queries*, IX, 4, 308; cf. A. S. Napier, *Mod. Lang. Notes*, XV, 11.

The hood was adopted by the laity from the clerical dress at the end of the twelfth century,[1] and was, in various forms, the universal head-covering for centuries in France and England.[2] In the fourteenth century it was a sort of pointed bag, with an oval opening for the face. The lower part of this hood covered the shoulders and upper chest, as can best be seen in reproductions of mediaeval drawings,[3] and such evidently is the "a kingez capados," with which the Green Knight's flowing hair and beard are compared. Brought closely round the head, "closed aloft," when traveling,[4] or wishing to remain incognito,[5] it "henged on his schulder," when its wearer so wished. Sir Gawain's "capados" is put on after his doublet; in an Old-French book of courtesy one finds the directions, "Vous mettrez ensuite votre blanchet ou votre futaine, puis vous affublerez votre chaperon."[6] The Latin word for the garment, *caputium*, *capitium*,[7] was rendered in French by *chaperon*,[8] which appears in Middle-High-German in several forms; *schaprûn*, *tschabrûn*,[9] etc. The French word rarely appears in Middle-English,[10] as the

[1] Quicherat, *Histoire du costume*, 160, 161; Du Cange, *s. v.* "*caputiati*," II, 167*b*.

[2] Quicherat, 160, 191, 195, 228; Viollet-le-Duc, III, 131 ff.; Gay, 330 ff.; Du Cange, *s. v.* "*caputium*," II, 166*b*.

[3] Schultz, I, 175; Planche, *Cyclopedia of Costume*, 293 ff.

[4] Alexander Neckam, *De nominibus utensilium*, "Equitaturus capam habeat . . . . cujus caputium aeris minas non exhorreat, vel sudum non formidat." *Eberts Jahrb.*, VII, 63; cf. 155; Schultz, I, 305; cf. Chaucer, *Book of the Duchesse*, 1028, "Go hoodles to the drye see;" *Works of Chaucer*, ed. Skeat, I, 486. In the citation from Neckam, the hood is a part of the cloak, as in such proverbial expressions as "Mal fait la chape, qui ne fait le chaperon," Tobler, *Li proverbe au vilain*, 56, 153. But this was not the case in the fourteenth century; cf. Gower, *C.A.V.*, 4786, 4787, "Fulofte time a man hath lost The large cote for the hod;" cf. *ibid.*, 7716.

[5] Du Cange, II, 166*c*; *s. v.* "*capucium clausum;*" *Flamenca*, 2222; 2545, 3183; *Rom. de Rou*, III, 1656, 2029; Schultz, I, 305.

[6] Quicherat, 200. On *blanchet* and *futaine* as synonyms of *doublet*, *ibid.*, 182, cf. *C.T.* 75, 76, "Of fustian he wered a gipoun, al bismotered with his habergeoun. '

[7] Du Cange, *s. v.* "*caputeum*, *caputium*, *capitium*." From *capitium*, doublet for *caputium*, must be distinguished *capitium*, "opening in the upper garment, through which the head was passed," which had a semantic and phonetic history of its own; cf. Du Cange, II, 146*b*; Horning, *Z. f. r. ph.*, XVIII, 234; *Mod. Phil.*, III, 543, n. 4.

[8] *Eberts Jahrb.* VII, 63; *Not. et extr.* XXVII, 2, 38. A common word in Old-French, even if Godefroy has only noted a few examples in *Dict. de l'anc. lang. franc.*, IX, 43.

[9] Schultz, I, 305; Benecke, *MHD Wörterb*, II, 287; H. Palander, *Mém. de la soc. néophilologique de Helsingfors*, III, 93, 126, 190.

[10] *N. E. D.* cites only one example from Wycliffe. As part of a woman's dress, worn in France in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries (Gay, 333), when imported into England it was known by its French name, or as a *French-hood*. Cf. the translation of Perrault's "Le petit chaperon rouge," by "Little Red Riding-Hood" in the eighteenth century—1729-44 (W. F. Prideaux, *Athenaeum*, April 13, 1907).

term *hode*[1] was preferably used. That the word *capados* is not peculiar to *Sir Gawayne and the Green Knight* is evidenced by its appearance elsewhere. Jamieson in his *Etymological Dictionary of the Scottish Language*[2] has cited two entries from the Aberdeen *Council Records* for 1548; "vii capidocis of veluet," "Capydois," and has noted that in Aberdeen at the time of his writing, "a hairy cap generally worn by boys was known as a capiedossie," a meaning not confined to this single locality in Scotland. What seems to be a corruption of the word is to be found in a document contemporaneous with *Sir Gawayne and the Green Knight.* In the accounts of John Marreys, King's Tailor, from the twenty-ninth of September, 18 Edw. III, 1344, to the first of August, 19 Edw. III, 1345, appears the item, ".ij. capedhusts;"[3] in the accounts of the General Wardrobe, for 22 Ed. III, 1348, is found the entry, "ad liniandum capedehustes Regis vij ulnas curte tele de Reynes;"[4] and again in the accounts of Marreys from the twenty-first of December, 19 Edw. III, 1345, to the thirty-first of January, 23 Edw. III, 1349, appears, "Et ad liniandum cappedehustes tunicas supertunicas et alia garnimenta Regis—L ulnas curte tele de Reyns."[5] One finds "captyhowse" as a gloss for "capitium" in a metrical Latin vocabulary;[6] and is this a less distorted form of the same word as "caprowsy" in Dunbar's *Flyting:* "And ane caprowsy barkit all with sweit,"[7] for which no rational etymon has been suggested? and is there not a further step from the original form of the word in John

[1] *Wright's Vocabularies*, 570, 23; 659, 23; 773, 35. Way, *Promptorium Parvulorum*, I, 242.

[2] I, 373. The word does not appear in *Extracts from the Council Register of the Burgh of Aberdeen*, ed. J. Stuart, 2 vols., 1844-48.

[3] N. H. Nicolas, *Archaeologia*, XXXI, 6; cf. 141, 142, where appears the misprint, "capedhurst."

[4] *Ibid.*, 13; cf. 142.

[5] *Ibid.*, 21, 143.

[6] MS. Arundel 248, fol. 88, Halliwell, *Dict. of Archaic and Provincial Words*, I, 230, *s. v.* "*capados*," has merely cited the word without the Latin word of which it is the gloss. From a transcript of a few lines of the manuscript, which I owe to my colleague Dr. J. S. P. Tatlock, who informs me it is about 120 lines in length, it is evidently of the same character as those printed in Wright's *Vocabularies*, 622 ff.

[7] Ed. Schipper, 330. Cf. the allusion to chaperon-wearing Scots, "Les Escos as caperons," in *Sone de Nausay*, 3027.

Russell's *Boke of Nurture*, where a chamberlain, attending his master's dressing, is bidden,

take hym hode or hat for his hed, cloke, or cappe de huse?[1]

That the name of a country should become the name of a garment is not an unknown semantic evolution, and we can fortunately follow some of the steps of the process in this case. An essential part of mediaeval protective armor was a hood-shaped covering worn under the hood-shaped head-dress of chain-mail, or coiffe.[2] An adoption of the *galerus*, "chapel de cuir,"[3] "chapel de comuns,"[4] peculiar to the dress of the peasant and common soldier since classical times,[5] it was made of felt or of leather, of the kind known from its treatment as "cuir boilli":

Fiert Renoart sor le chapel voltis;
Bon fu li feutre qui n'est un point malmis;[6]
En sont chief ot un chapel enformé
De cuir de Tarce bien bolli et serré;
Et par desore son vert elme gemé,
A xxx laz, qui toz sont boutonné.[7]
Fiert le paien desor l'iaume à esmax;
Ne lui valut ne coiffe, ne chapiax,[8]
S'il ne l'eust si bien covert
D'un fort chapel de cuir boli,
Qui son cop auques.[9]

[1] F. J. Furnivall, *The Babees Book*, p. 178, l. 909; cf. pp. cvii–cix, cxxxiii. Part II, 69, "? cape for the house."

[2] *Mod. Phil.*, III, 452; add Layamon, III, 267, 475, 505, "burne-hood," *Tristan Sage*, ed. Kölbing, 36, 7, "brynjuhattrin."

[3] *Not. et extr.*, XXII, 2, 528; cf. "il estoient armé comme vilain de queries et de capeaus de cuir bouilli;" Artus, ap. Godefroy, II, 397.

[4] *Eberts Jahrb.*, VI, 312. For its further development into the *chapel de fer* worn by peasants in battle cf. *Rom. de Rou*, III, 7693; *Aiol*, 5896; *Claris*, 22437, and later generally as a light helmet cf. Joinville, *Hist. de S. Louis*, ed. Wailly, 545. Cf. *Prov. capel;* Bertrand de Born, ed. Stimmung, 19, 16; *Guillaume de la Barre*, 931, 947, 1120; also Engl. *palet*, *sallet*, *kettle-hat; Promptorium Parvulorum*, ed. Way, I, 273; II, 378; *Percy-Folio*, II, 582, 586, 588.

[5] A. Pauly, *Realencyklopaedie*, III, 558; Schiller & Voght, *Die römischen Staats-, Kriegs- und Privatalterthümer*, 2d ed., 463; R. Ellis, *A Bodleian MS of Copa, etc.*, 10.

[6] *Aliscans*, 6610; cf. 4567, "Com un chapel de feutre acoveter," and on *acoveter*, G. Paris, *Rom.*, XV, 628; Tobler, *Herrigs Archiv*, CVII, 449; Viollet-le-Duc, V, 250, 259; Schultz, II, 51, fail to cite any evidence to substantiate their statements that this head-dress was made of quilted material. Cf. W. Foerster, *Sone*, 6260.

[7] *Aliscans*, ed. Wienbeck, 76, var. "cuir de gadres." The correction of the reading "tacce" into "tarse" hardly needs comment, but cf. Schultz, I, 340, 349; F. Michel, *Recherches sur les etoffes de soie*, etc., 164, 466; P. Toynbee, *Dante Studies*, 115; Heyd, *Histoire du commerce*, II, 700.

[8] *Aliscans*, 6494.

[9] *Percival*, ed. Potvin, VI, 252; cf, *Chans. d'Antioche*, I, 197, n.

At a later period this head-dress was known as the *huvette:*

Que heame et coeffe trenche, et la huvette franche;[1]

a diminutive of the Germanic word OHG *hûba*, ON *hûfa*, AS *hufe;*[2] which in its MHG form, *hube*,[3] has the same meaning as the more specific word *batwât*, which owes its name, "vermutlich, weil man diese haut auch im bade nicht ablegt."[4] The MHG *huot*[5] is also used in the same specific sense as *chapel;* and the derivatives of OF *coiffe*, *coife*, and *gupfe*[6]—underwent a semantic as well as a phonetic change. At a later period the *coiffe* of chain-mail was no longer used to protect the head; reduced in size, and known as the *camail*, it only covered the shoulders and the back of the neck, making one piece with the iron-plate head-dress, known as the *bacinet.*[7] In a French document, contemporaneous with our Gawain poem, mention is made of "un *chaperon* à metre sous mon bacinet, de drap, de cendal, ou de satin, cousu et garni de fil de soie;[8] and the word *how*—of which the etymology is clear—in Gawain Douglas' translation of the *Aeneid:*

Thair haris all war tukkit wp on thar croun,
That baith with how and helm was thristed doun;[9]

seems to have just this special signification. The "cuir bouilli," of which the *chapel* was made, was widely used in the manufacture of various parts of the armor, and of other articles,[10] and was often spoken of as "cuir de Capadoce."[11] One thinks at once of "damask" and "holland," of "satin"[12] and "china," of "port" and

[1] Jehan des Preis, *Geste de Liège*, 6133; cf. Froissart, *Chron.*, XI, 158, ed. Kervyn de Lettenhove; Archaeologia, XXI, 386. For the identity of *chapel de cuir* and *huvette*, cf. *Conquête de Jérusalem*, 2779; *Chevalier au cygne*, ed Reiffenberg, 22449.

[2] Cf. Gachet, *Glossaire*, 92, 260, 26L; G. Paris, *Rom.*, III, 113; Bugge, *ibid.*, IV, 361.

[3] Herbort v. Fritzlar, *Liet v. Troye*, 10350; *Lanz.*, 4539; *Frauend.*, 529, 1; Schultz, II, 56, only notes its use with the meaning *chapelier*. On this *chapel de fer*, *chapel d'acier*, *chapelier*, cf. Schultz, II, 55; Schirling, 74.

[4] J. Grimm, *Z. f. deutsch. Alt.*, I, 137.

[5] Schultz, II, 50; *Rolandslied*, ed. Bartsch, 8519.

[6] Schultz, II, 51.

[7] Viollet-le-Duc, V, 157 ff., 162-64, 248.

[8] Gay, 99, *sub. ann.* 1386.

[9] *Works of G. Douglas*, ed. Small, II, 257: a translation of *Aen.*, V, 556: "Omnibus in morem tonsa pressa corona."

[10] Cf., e. g., *Chans. d'Ant.*, IV. 189; Du Cange, VII, 345; *Archaeolog.*, XXVI, 399; Viollet-le-Duc, I, 383; V, 101, 105; VI, 126; Gay, 515, 516.

[11] Gay, 516, cites "cuir de Cahes (Tunisie)" and "à la fachon de Tunes," where "cuir bouilli" is meant, but the expression had no further development.

[12] Heyd, *Hist. du Commerce*, II, 701.

"sherry," as instances of the name of a country or city, where an article originated, being given to the article itself;[1] in "ulster" and "arras" we have instances of a further development, in which the name of the material has been given to the article made of it; and to this latter category *capados* belongs. When this headdress was made of felt, it might still owe its name to the material of which it was made, for in *Girard de Rousillon* we find the hero sitting: "Desobre un feltre obrat de Capadoine,"[2] a form of the word which is due to metrical exigencies, if not the word itself.[3]

The order in which the hero of *Sir Gawayne and the Green Knight* dons and doffs his armor shows the identity of the *capados* and hood with the *chapel*, and with each other. For the protection of the upper body a hauberk is put on over the doublet:

> & syþen þe brawden bryne of bryȝt stel rynge ȝ,
> Vmbe-weued þat wyȝ, vpon wlonk stuffe;[4]

and finally the cote à armer, a surcoat charged with armorial bearings.[5] The author did not have to tell his fourteenth-century readers that the *coiffe* of the hauberk was naturally drawn over the head, on top of the protecting *capados*, and on this *coiffe*—the *auentayle* of the poem[6]—the helmet was placed and fastened with the hourson, or band of embroidered silk:[7]

> þenne hentes he þe helme, & hastily hit kysses,
> þat watȝ stapled stifly, & stoffed wyth-inne;
> Hit watȝ hyȝe on his hede, hasped bihynde,
> Wyth a lyȝtli vrysoun ouer þe auentayle,
> Enbrawden & bounden wyth þe best gemmeȝ,
> On brode sylkyn borde, & bryddeȝ on semeȝ.[8]

[1] To cite only examples of English and French formations; cf. the numerous instances of formations from Latin adjectives: *dalmatique*, *parchement*, etc., the OF *corduane*, and its derivatives.

[2] Ed. W. Foerster, 1133; ed. Michel, p. 18.

[3] Michel, *Recherches sur les étoffes*, II, 147.

[4] 580, 581. There is no reason to render "bryne" by "habergeon," as the editor does; cf. Way, *Prompt. Parv.*, I, 220. On the epithet "blans," applied to hauberk, cf. Schirling, 33.

[5] On the *cote armour* cf. 636, 2028; *N. E. D.*, *s. v.* "*coat-armour;*" Schultz, II, 58; Quicherat, 179, 207; Way, *Prompt. Parv.*, I, 95, 124; Du Cange, VII, *Dissert*, 1 ff.

[6] On a similar use of the word, *Mod. Phil.*, III, 542.

[7] Cf. "garni ledit bacinet, lié, tenant et attaché avec un hourson d'estoffes de bourre, de soye, de cotton;" Lettre de 1386, *ap.* Godefroy, IV, 498; cf. Du Cange, II, 47; Viollet-le-Duc, V, 12, 112, Pl. 34; 123, Pl. 39; VI, 235, Pl. 9. It is certainly not the merely ornamental *cointise*, as stated by Madden.

[8] 605–10.

Before his first stroke the Green Knight bids Sir Gawain

Haf þy helme of þy hede, & haf here þy pay,[1]

and again, without referring to the coiffe, the author states that Gawain bent his head, showing his bare neck:

He lened with þe nek, & lutte,
& schewed þat schyre al bare,[2]

although it is only before the second blow that he is bidden to hold his hood in his hand. Both *capados* and *hode* are used indifferently to denote the Old-French *chaperon* and *chapel*, and the further semantic development of *capados* has already been exemplified by citations.[3]

But whence the epithet "king's capados," "þe hyȝe hode, þat Arþur þe raȝt?"[4] The answer to this question is the final step in solving our problem. Fifteen years ago, Gollancz suggested that "the story of Gawain's adventure with the wife of the Green Knight seemed to point unmistakably to King Edward's adventure with the Countess of Salisbury, as told by Froissart. The fact is clear that there is some connection between the romance of Gawain and the romantic origin of the Garter, for at the end of the MS of the romance a somewhat later hand has written the famous legend of the Order,

Hony soit qui mal y penc.

This view is further confirmed by the use made of the same story to account for the origin of the Order of the Bath, in a ballad *rifacimento* of the Green Knight." That a part of these conclusions is a certainty will be evident from what follows.

The earliest records of the beginnings of the Order of the Garter are to be found in the *Wardrobe Accounts* of Edward III, between the twenty-ninth of September, 1348, and the thirty-first of January, 1349. Among other articles made for the king's

[1] 2247. [2] 2255, 2256. [3] 2297, cf. 2247 supra.

[4] Miss E. M. Wright in her comment on *capados* notes the Yorkshire and Devonshire dialect word *capadosha* used as adjective and adverb meaning, "excellent, splendid," "in a superior manner, excellently;" adding, "it would be in favour of the theory that *capados* is derived from *Cappadocia*, whence came the beautiful material of which it was made" (*Engl. Stud.*, XXXVI, 210). But is not the dialect word of recent coinage, used with no more reference to its real meaning than the old lady's "blessed word Mesopotamia"? In the seventeenth century a slang word for "prison" was *cappadochio*, *caperdochy*, *caperdewsie*, which has never been satisfactorily explained. Farmer and Henley, *Slang and Its Analogues*, II, 34.

person are noted a mantle, hood, and surcoat, of long blue cloth strewn with garters, "Clamadis supertunice, et capucii pro corpore Regis de panno longo blueto poudrato[1] cum garteriis."[2] It was the custom of the king to distribute robes and habits to members of the royal household,[3] and although the earliest record of such a distribution of the livery of the order is in September, 1351,[4] subsequent entries in the records are frequent.[5] The mantle was not always given by the sovereign, but the material for the surcoat and hood was regularly granted.[6] In the history of the order we find that the material and fashion of these garments constantly changed;[7] those worn in the time of Edward III conform in every way to the details given in *Sir Gawayne and the Green Knight*. In the earliest records cited above, the surcoat and hood made for the king were of blue cloth; but in 1363 the Sovereign's and Companions' were sanguine in grain:

Militibus de Societate Garterii ad robas sibi contra festum Sanct Georgii de dono domini Regis faciendas et furrandas, et capucias earum liniandas, viz. cuilibet eorum quinque ulnas panni sangueni in grano et unam furruram de CC. ventris miniveri.[8]

The color of the material varied, the *Wardrobe Records* are scanty and fragmentary,[9] and this is the only instance preserved from the reign of Edward III, when it is red, as is the case with Gawain's surcoat:

Þe gordel of þe grene silk, þat gay wel bisemed,
Vpon þat ryol red cloþe, þat ryche watȝ to schewe.[10]

The same color "sanguine," appears in the *Wardrobe Records* for 13 Richard II,[11] and scarlet appears in the 21[12] and 22[13] Richard

[1] Cf. Du Cange, *s. v.*; W. Gregor, Poems of Dunbar, III, 18.

[2] Harris Nicholas, *History of the Orders of Knighthood*, I, 12; II, 339, App., vi.

[3] *Ibid.*, II, *App.*, vi, vii, xvi, xvii, lii*-liii*. On custom cf. Schultz, I, 186, n. 3, 318; Way, *Prompt. parv.*, I, 87, 308; Du Cange, VII, 347, 357.

[4] Nicholas, I, 25. [5] *Ibid.*, II, *App.*, xvii ff. [6] *Ibid.*, II, 339.

[7] If not yearly, as stated by Ashmole, *Institutions, Laws and Ceremonies, of the Most Noble Order of the Garter*, 1715, 160.

[8] Nicholas, II, 347; Ashmole, 160-161.

[9] Nicholas, *Archaeologia*, XXXI, 134 ff. Perhaps it is not too bold to conjecture that in 1351 the Companions' robes, of which the material is not noted in the accounts (Anstis, *Register of the Garter*, I, 105), were of red velvet as those of the king (*Arch.*, XXXI, 136; cf. 163).

[10] 2035, 2036. [11] Anstis, I, 6, n. d.; Ashmole, 164; Nicholas, II, 344, notes 7 and 8.

[12] A dubious instance, Nicholas, II, 344, n. 7.

[13] Anstis, I, 13, n. f.; Nicholas, II, 344, n. 7.

II, but in these instances the hood was lined with cloth of a different color, and with fur, as was the case in the earlier record,[1] and in *Sir Gawayne.* If in the poem the knight's surcoat and hood are lined with ermine "blaunner,"[2] instead of miniver "pured gris," "gris and gray,"[3] as in the *Wardrobe Records*, where only royal garments are purfled with ermine, it must be noted that only the richer fur is mentioned in *Sir Gawayne.*[4]

There was good reason why the hood of the Garter in the time of Edward III should be lined with fur, like that of Gawain; as it was the very year of the founding of the Order that a chronicler notes among the spoils of the French campaign, dispersed through the land, "vestes, furruras,"[5] while in 1362 the king thought it necessary to pass a sumptuary law forbidding the wearing of furs, except by the very wealthy of the nobility.[6] And does the author compare the Green Knight's hair and beard to the "king's capados" to distinguish it from the small, effeminate hoods, against which some of the chronicles of that time cry out?[7] It is to be noted that, like the "capidocis" in the Aberdeen records, the hood of the Garter at a later period was made of velvet.[8]

I hope I have shown the meaning of *capados* and its derivation, to discard without comment the potential French "cap-à-dos,"

[1] A notable exception to this rule is 34 Ed. II, when the surcoats were black, and the hoods lined with scarlet cloth; Anstis, I, 42, n.; II, 50; Ashmole, 167; Nicholas, II, 344, n. 8., 347.

[2] Kaluza's correct explanation of *blaunner* as "white-black," i. e., ermine (*Libeaus Desconus*, 136, 137) is confirmed by Du Cange, who notes that the nature of the fur "a donné sujet aux hérauds de blazonner l'hermine d'un soul nom, sans exprimer le blanc et le noir" (*Glossarium*, VII; *Dissertations sur l'histoire de St. Louis*, 3); cf. *Queen Elizabeth's Achademy*, ciii, 100; *N. E. D.*, *s. v.* "*ermine.*" 2 and 4. Cf. "Das Hermelin . . . . hat seinen Namen, OHG harmo . . . . augenscheinlich von der Farbe seines Winterfells erhalten und heiszt der 'Bereifte, Schneeweisse,'" L. Laistner, *Germ.*, XXXI, 426.

[3] Anstis, II, 50, 55; Nicholas, II, 344; cf. 37 Ed. III, c. 12, where privileged nobility "usent a lour volunté forspris ermynes," etc.

[4] Cf. 155, 573, 856, 1931. The "pane," "pane of bryȝt blaunnier" (154, 855, 856) is not "cloth" in either case, or "counterpane" in the second instance, as the *N. E. D.* would have it, but "furs" in the general sense, to be entered under pane. Cf. Schultz, I, 357; Way, *Prompt. Parv.*, 381; Du Cange, *Diss.* 3; *Eberts Jahrb.*, VI.

[5] *Chronicon Angliae*, ed. E M. Thompson, 261; cf. xxxiv.

[6] 37 Ed. III, ch. 10-12. Cf. *Chron. Angl.*, 53, "ut nulli pannis pretiosis aut pellura uterentur."

[7] *Eulogium Historiarum* (1362), III, 230; cf. xli, "Habent etiam capucia parva sub mento stricta modo mulierum." Cf. Knighton, *Chron.*, II, 57-59.

[8] Nicholas, II, 347.

invented by Madden,[1] the allusions in the poem to the Order of the Garter, and the other evidence which I have pointed out confirm the generally accepted date[2] of the last half of the fourteenth century, or more precisely between the foundation of the Order of the Garter, and the death of Edward III (1348–77). Gollancz's primary suggestion of a connection between the adventures of Gawain with the wife of the Green Knight, and Edward's wooing of the Countess of Salisbury, as told by Froissart,[3] does not bear close scrutiny. The episode in the poem is a "test" story[4] in which the woman makes all the advances; in the chronicle the rebuke the king received from the countess, whose virtue he assails, is the main point in the story,[5] that which appealed to the popular fancy, and found expression in ballad,[6] story,[7] and play.[8] Although it may well be that this story, and Froissart's further account[9] of the jousts instituted by the king in honor of the countess in 1342, may have been the source of the traditional account, explaining the name and origin of the order, with which she was first connected in the *Historia Anglica* of Polydore Virgil, which appeared 150 years after the founding of the order.[10]

The author of the *Green Knight* has, in the main, followed his French source, an episodic poem;[11] he was too much of an

[1] Cf. Bradley's citation of an OF *ombrière*, a word which has never been glossed, as the source of the ME *umbrere;* Bradley-Stratmann, *Middle-English Dictionary*, 708.

[2] Cf. A. H. Billings, *A Guide to the English Metrical Romances*, 166, for bibliography.

[3] *Chron.*, II, 59; III, 455, 467; IV, 122; XXIII, 101; cf. G. Liebau, *König Eduard III von England und die Gräfin von Salisbury*, 8–17.

[4] I. e., of chastity. The third blow that "seuered þe hyde" is like the mantle on Craddocke's lady: "Vpp att her great toe/itt began to crinkle and crowt" (Child's *Ballads*, I, 273; cf. 260, n.), and in both cases confession redeems the minor fault. Compare, also, the first failure of Gawain to don the "test" glove in Heinrich von dem Türlin's *Crône*, Child, *ibid.*, 266, note. The indebtedness of this episode to the adventure of Gawain with the sister of Guigambrésil in Chrétien's *Perceval* is not apparent; cf. G. Paris, *Rom.*, XII, 378; J. Weston, *Legend of Sir Gawain*, 96.

[5] Cf. Liebau, 128.

[6] Liebau, 116, 129, 130; cf. 131, 136.

[7] Liebau, 26–58, 75–92, 131, 137; *Herrigs Archiv*, CVIII, 134–36, 138; Bolte, *Z. f. vergl. Lit.*, N. F., II, 369.

[8] Liebau, 68–75, 92–116, 121–25, 137, 144 ff.; *Herrigs Archiv*, CVIII, 136–38; Bolte, *l. c.* Liebau, *König Eduard von England im Lichte europäischer Poesie*, 26–35.

[9] *Chron.*, II, 121.

[10] Nicholas, I, 17, 18; Libeau, 21–25.

[11] G. Paris, *Rom.*, XII, 379; *Hist. litt.*, XXX, 78, 72; Weston, *Legend of Sir Perceval*, I, 283 ff.

artist to change the traditional "gordel" of protection[1] into the garter of the order. The allusions in his detailed descriptions of Gawayn's attire would be evident in the court circle, of which he was clearly a member. How superior to the procedure of the contemporary author of *Winnere and Wastoure*, whose intention is all too apparent, in his double use of the "gartare of Ynde," and his translation of the motto, "Hetyng haue the hathell at any harme thynkes."[2] In the same way the ballad of the *Green Knight*,[3] whether it had its source in the Middle-English poem or in an independent version, is bare of all detail; the fanciful allusions have become a deliberate explanation of a custom of the Order of the Bath; the "Gordel of þe grene silke"—symbolical token of magical powers[4]—has become the white silk lace, one of the insignia of a carpet knight.

GEORGE L. HAMILTON
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

[1] Originally a shirt; cf. Grimm, *Deutsche Myth.*, 3d ed., 1052; Uhland, *Schriften*, I, 183; II, 61; VII, 307; F. Settegast, *Quellenstudien zur galloroman. Epik.*, 68; Jones and Kropf *Folk-Tales of Magyars*, 353; Weston, *Leg. of S. Gaw.*, 100; Zimmer, *Z. f. d. Alth.*, XXXII, 319, 321 ff., 465. On protective rings and stones, cf. Child, *Ballads*, I, 189, 190, 201, note; II, 61, 318; V, 183, 287; K. Smith, *Amer. Journ. of Phil.*, XXIII, 268, 269, note; A. L. C. Brown, *Iwain*, 128.

[2] W. and W. in *The Parlement of the Thre Ages*, ed. Gollancz, 1897 (Roxburghe Club), W. and W., 62, 94. On the proverbial use of the motto prior to Edward III, G. Liebau, *Herrigs Archiv*, CVIII, 134.

[3] *Percy-Folio*, II, 56.

[4] On green as the color of the clothes of unearthly beings, cf. F. Liebrecht, *Gervasius von Tilbury*, 121, 177; J. G. Frazer, *Golden Bough*, 2d ed., II, 78; *Adonis, Attis, Osiris*, 138. On the green cloak of the giant in the Irish analogue, *Fled Bricrend*, cf. Zimmer, *Gött. gel. Anz.*, 1900, 383, 384; without accepting the conclusion that the description of the giant is modeled on that of a Norseman, *ibid.*, 386, 387.

THE FORMATION OF COMPOUND WORDS IN GOTHIC

In his *Gotisches Elementarbuch*, § 233, and in his *Urgermanische Grammatik*, § 145, Streitberg expresses the belief that the connecting vowel in compound words in Gothic tends to remain after a short-stem syllable, but disappears after a long syllable or trisyllable. This applies to the *a*-, *ja*-, *wa*-, *i*-, and *u*-stems. The *ja*-stems show the retention of *ja*- after a short syllable and a reduction to *i*- after a long syllable. For example, *wadja-bōkōs*, but *arbi-numja*. The *n*-stems are formed after the analogy of the *a*-stems.

The following compounds conform to the explanation of Streitberg:[1]

Short-Syllable *a*-Stems

aihwa-tundi, *ala-brunsts*, *ala-mans*, *ala-þarbs*, *ala-swērei*, *baira-bagms*, *daura-wards*, *dwala-waurdei*, *fruma-baur*, *guda-faurhts*, *guda-laus*, *guda-skaunei*, *kuna-wida*, *laþa-leikō*, *muka-mōdei* (?), *þrasa-balþei*, *un-tila-malsks*, *waira-leikō*, *wiga-deina*.

Long-Syllable *a*-Stems

ain-falþs, *ain-hwarþaruh*, *ain-hwarjizuh*, *ain-lif*, *all-andjō*, *all-brunsts*, *all-waldans*, *anþar-leikō*, *hals-agga*, *haubiþ-wunda*, *hauh-hairtō*, *hauh-þūhts*, *laus-handus*, *laus-qiþrs*, *manag-falþs*, *mikil-þūhts*, *þiuþ-spillōn*, *ubil-tōjis*, *ubil-waurds*, *wein-drugkja*.

wa-Stem

balwa-wēsei.

Short-Syllable *ja*-Stems

alja-leikōs, *alja-kuns*, *fraþja-marzeins*, *lubja-leis*, *midja-sweipains*, *wadja-bōkōs*.

Long-Syllable *ja*-Stems

aglaiti-waurdei, *andi-laus*, *arbi-numja*, *frei-hals*, *winþi-skaurō*.

[1] The words given in this article comprise all compounds except those made up of a late foreign word in one or both parts of the compound. In cases where there are two words made up of the same compounds, e. g., *ain-falþs* and *ain-falþaba*, only one is given unless the corresponding Greek form for the one is materially different from that of the other.

All compounds of *ō*-stems have a long syllable in the first part of the compound. According to Streitberg, the connecting vowel *a*- is a shortening of the stem vowel after the long syllable. The following few words are found:

ō-STEMS

airþa-kunþs, *hleiþra-stakeins*, *hweila-hwairbs*, *mōta-staþs*.

jō-STEM

þusundi-faþs.

wō-STEM

friaþwa-milds.

i-STEMS

brūþ-faþs, *mati-balgs*.

u-STEMS

faihu-friks, *faihu-gawaurkei*, *faihu-geigō*, *faihu-gairns*, *faihu-þraihns*, *faihu-skula*, *filu-deisei*, *filu-faihs*, *filu-galaubs*, *filu-waurdei*, *qiþu-hafts*.

In the *n*-stems the connecting vowel is always *a*- except in the case of *man-leika* which, representing an I.E. **monn-*, would be a regular traditional form like *þrūts-fill*. The *s*-stems have no connecting vowel. Of *r*-stems there are only two compounds, *brōþra-lubō* (Cod. A) and *brōþru-lubō* (Cod. B).

Opposed to the forty *a*-stems given above there is about the same number of *a*-stems which are not explained by Streitberg's theory; that is, they are words which, although having the long syllable, still retain the connecting vowel. Of the *i*- and the *u*-stems there is likewise a large number of words which do not conform to this explanation. How are we to account for this? Mr. F. A. Wood suggests in explanation of these words the following theory, which I have submitted to a test:

Compound words in Gothic are of two kinds, traditional and new compounds. Streitberg's theory is correct as regards the traditional compounds. But there is a large number of words which were made by the Gothic translator himself, in order to translate adequately the Greek or Latin text. For instance, to translate such a word as ψευδολόγων, I Tim. 4:2, he wrote *liugna-waurdē*, an exact correspondence in the parts of the compound;

or for *ἀλύσεσιν*, Luke 8:29, *eisarna-bandjōm*, which, while not corresponding in structure, may easily have been a new compound. Or, to take the two compounds *laus-qiþrs* and *lausawaurdi:* the first may well have been a traditional compound, *laus-qiþrans*, Mark 8:3, translating the Greek *νήστεις*; the second, a new compound, *lausa-waurdja* translating the Greek *κενοφονίας*. In forming new compounds the translator would follow the analogy of existing compounds, but without any feeling for traditional differences. If the first part of the compound was an *a*-stem, he would naturally make *a*- the connecting vowel, regardless of the length of the preceding syllable. Irregularities and confusion of stems, then, are probable in *þiuþi-qissais*, *εὐλογίας*, I Cor. 10:16, stem *þiuþa-; garda-waldans*, *οἰκοδεσπότης*, *miþ-garda-waddjus*, *μεσότοιχον*, stem *gardi-*. Irregularities in the same words are sometimes found: *andi-laus*, *ἀπέραντος*, I Tim. 1:4 (Cod. A), but *anda-laus* (Cod. B), stem *andja-;* or *brōþra-lubōn*, *φιλαδελφίᾳ*, Rom. 12:10 (Cod. A), and *brōþrulubōn*, *φιλαδελφίας*, I Thess. 4:9 (Cod. B).

The following full list of long-syllable and trisyllable words, unexplained by Streitberg, may by comparison with the Greek or Latin forms be seen to have been new compounds: *aina-baura*, Lat. *unigenito*, Skeir. V, *d; aina-mundiþa*, *ἑνότητα*, Eph. 4:3; *aiza-smiþa*, *χαλκεύς*, II Tim. 4:14; *akrana-laus*, *ἄκαρπος*, Mark 4:19; *alla-waurstwans*, *πεπλεροφορεμένος*, Col. 4:12; *arma-hairtai*, Lat. *misericordes*, Eph. 4:32; *arma-hairtei* (*ἔλεος*), Lat. *misericordia*, Luke 1:50; *blōþa-rinnandei*, *αἱμορρόουσα*, Matt. 9:20; *dulga-haitjin*, *χρεωφειλέται*, Luke 7:41; *eisarna-bandjōm*, *ἁλύσεσιν*, Luke 8:29; *figgra-gulþ*, *δακτύλιον*, Luke 15:22; *fulla-fahjan*, *ἱκανὸν ποιῆσαι*, Mark 15:15; *fulla-tōjai*, *τέλειοι*, Matt. 5:48; *fulla-weisai*, *τέλειοι*, I Cor. 14:20; *fulla-witans*, *τέλειοι*, Phil. 3:15; *gilstra-mēleins*, *ἀπογραφή*, Luke 2:2; *gōda-kunds*, *εὐγενής*, Luke 19:12; *grinda-fraþjans*, *ὀλιγοψύχους*, I Thess. 5:14; *heiwa-fraujin*, *οἰκοδεσπότῃ*, Mark 14:14; *himina-kundis*, *οὐρανίου*, Luke 2:13; *hunda-fadē þan sumis*, *ἑκατοντάρχου δε τινος*, Luke 7:2; *hunsla-stada*, *θυσιαστήριον*, Matt. 5:23; *ibnaleika*, Lat., *parem*, Skeir. V *d.; ibna-skaunjamma*, *σύμμορφον*, Phil. 3:21; *jugga-laups*, *νεανίσκος*, Mark 14:51; *lagga-mōdein*,

μακροθυμίᾳ, Rom. 9:22; *lausa-waurdein*, ματαιολογίαν, I Tim. 1:6; *lausa-waurdja*, κενοφωνίας, II Tim. 2:16; *liuba-leik*, προσφιλῆ, Phil. 4:8; *galiuga-brōþrum*, ψευδαδέλφοις, II Cor. 11:26; *galiuga-gudam*, εἰδωλόθυτα, I Cor. 8:10; *galiuga-weitwōds*, ψευδομάρτυρες, I Cor. 15:15; *liugna-waurdē*, ψευδολόγων, I Tim. 4:2; *swulta-wairþjawas*, ἤμελλεν τελευτᾶν, Luke 7:2; *waurdajiukōs*, λογομαχίας, I Tim. 6:4; *witōda-fastjōs*, νομικοί, Luke 7:30; *witōda-laisarjōs*, νομοδιδάσκαλοι, Luke 5:17; *witōda-lausam*, ἀνόμοις, I Cor. 9:21.

ja-STEMS

hrainja-hairtans, καθαροὶ τῇ καρδίᾳ, Matt. 5:8; *niuja-satidana*, νεόφυτον, I Tim. 3:6.

i-STEMS

gabaurþi-waurdē, γενιαλογίας, I Tim. 1-4; *undaurni-mat*, ἄριστον, Luke 14:12; *frasti-sibja*, υἱοθεσία, Rom. 9:4; *gasti-gōds*, φιλόξενον, I Tim. 3:2; *gasti-gōdein*, φιλοξενίαν, Rom. 12:13; *naudi-bandjōm eisarneinaim*, ἁλύσει, Mark 5:3; *naudi-þaurft*, ἀναγκαῖον, II Cor. 9:5.

u-STEMS

asilu-qairns, μύλος ὀνικός, Mark 9:42; *fōtu-baurd*, ὑποπόδιον, Matt. 5:35; *fōtu-bandjōm*, πέδαις, Luke 8:29; *grundu-waddju*, θεμέλιον, Luke 6:48; *handu-waurhtōn*, χειροποίητον, Mark 14:58; *hardu-hairtein*, σκληροκαρδίαν, Mark 10:5; *lustu-sama*, ἐπιπόθητοι, Phil. 4:1.

Then there are long-syllable words which, while not so directly suggested by the Greek as these above, may, nevertheless, be new compounds.

a-STEMS

anstai auda-hafts, κεχαριτωμένη, Luke 1:28; *fulla-fraþjan*, σοφρονεῖν, II Cor. 5:13; *launa-wargōs*, ἀχάριστοι, II Tim. 3:2; *silda-leik*, θάμβος, Luke 5:9; *silda-leiks*, θαυμαστή, Mark 12:11; *skauda-raip skōhē*, ἱμάντα ὑποδημάτων, Mark 1:7; *weina-basja*, σταφυλάς, Matt. 7:16; *weina-gard*, ἀμπελῶνα, Mark 12:1; *weinatains*, κλῆμα, John 15:4; *weina-triu*, ἄμπελος, John 15:1.

wa-STEM

hraiwa-dūbōnō, τρυγόνων, Luke 2:24.

i-STEMS

aurti-gards, κῆπος, John 18:1; *drauhti-witōþ*, στρατείαν, I Tim. 1:18.

Not all words which conform to Streitberg's explanation are traditional compounds, however.[1] There are new compounds formed with short syllables in the first part of the compound which have a connecting vowel and, on the other hand, there are new compounds containing a long syllable with syncopation, as seen by the examples which follow.

SHORT-SYLLABLE *a*-STEMS

ala-brunstein, ὁλοκαυτωμάτων, Mark 12:33; *ala-waldans*, παντοκράτωρ, II Cor. 6:18; *daura-wards*, θυρωρός, John 10:3; *dwala-waurdei*, μωρολογία, Eph. 5:4; *fruma-baur*, πρωτότοκον, Lat. *primo-genitum*, Luke 2:7; *guda-faurhts*, εὐλαβής, Luke 2:25; *guda-lausai*, ἄθεοι, Eph. 2:12; *in guda-skaunein*, ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ, Phil. 2:6; *waira-leikō taujaiþ*, ἀνδρίζεσθε, I Cor. 16:13.

We may put here also three short-syllable stems with syncopation which may well be new compounds:

in gud-hūsa, ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ, John 18:20; *guþ-blōstreis*, θεοσεβής, John 9:31, stem *guda-*; *þut-haurna*, σάλπιγγι, I Cor. 15:52, stem *þuta-*(?).

LONG-SYLLABLE *a*-STEMS

all-andjō, ὁλοτελεῖς, I Thess. 5:23; *manag-falþ*, πολλαπλασίονα, Luke 18:30; *ubil-tōjis*, κακοποιός, John 18:30; *wein-drugkja*, οἰνοπότης, Luke 7:34.

There are other possible explanations for this last word. It may have been a very early formation and then have lost its connecting vowel phonetically after the long syllable. It would thus conform to Streitberg's explanation. Then, too, it may have been formed after such a construction as *wein drigkan*, which explanation has also been given for *guþ-blōstreis*, i. e., from *guþ blōtan*. On the explanation of *aglait-gastaldans*, αἰσχροκερδεῖς, I Tim. 3:8, stem **aglaita-*, see Leo Meyer, *Die Gothische Sprache*, §§ 93, 359. This may, however, easily be a new formation.

[1] See first list of words.

ja-STEMS

alja-kunja, ἀλλογενής, Luke 17:18; *aglaiti-waurdein*, αἰσχρολογίαν, Col. 3:8.

The *ō*-stems are probably all new compounds.

airþa-kundana, Lat. *terrestrem*, Skeir. IV, *c*; *hleiþra-stakeins*, σκηνοπηγία, John 7:2; *hweila-hwairbai*, πρόσκαιροι, Mark 4:17; *mōta-stada*, τελώνιον, Luke 5:27.

jō-STEM

þusundi-fadim, χιλιάρχοις, Mark 6:21.

wō-STEM

friaþwa-mildai, φιλόστοργοι, Rom. 12:10.

u-STEMS

ni faihu-friks, ἀφιλάργυρον, I Tim. 3:3; *faihu-gairnai*, φιλάργυροι, II Tim. 3:2; *faihu-gairneins*, αἰσχροῦ κέρδους, Tit. 1:11; *filu-galaubis*, πολυτίμου, John 12:3; *filu-waurdein*, πολυλογίᾳ, Matt. 6:7,

The above examples show us that for the new compounds (1) the *a*-stems will generally have *a*- as connecting vowel, though there are instances where it is left out altogether after both long and short syllables; (2) the *ō*-stems may take their connecting vowel analogically from the *a*-stems; (3) the *u*-stems regularly follow the traditional forms.

There are a few compounds which we cannot classify under any of the above heads. *midjun-gard* must have been a traditional compound; cf. OE *middan-geard*, OHG *mittin-gart*, which point to an *n*-stem formation. But *þiu-magus*, παῖς, Matt. 8:6, stem *þiwa-*; *niu-klahein*, Lat. *pusillanimitatem*, Skeir. VII, *a*; *niu-klahaim*, νηπίοις, Luke 10:21, may well be new formations and as such very likely went after the analogy of the *u*-stems. For the form *niu-*, which cannot be directly connected with the adjective-stem *niuja-*, suggests a stem *niwa-*. The nominative of this would be **nius*, whence *niu-* in compounds, corresponding to *handus*, *handu-*.

SAMUEL KROESCH

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

WHAT IF A DAY

The publication of the *Shirburn Ballads* has brought us another proof of the popularity of this song. The form in which it occurs in that collection (No. LIX) calls for no special remark: with here and there a scribal difference, it is the same as No. XII of my paper (*Modern Philology*, IV, 3), that is to say the version of the *Roxburgh Ballads*. The song is headed by an editor's note, which winds up as follows: "The verses are found also in a Bodleian MS, MS Rawlinson poet. 112, fol. 9, and are there attributed to 'E. of E.?' Robert Devereux, second earl of Essex." The summary catalogue of this MS says: "foll. 9, 10, 11, 'Verses or English poemes written by the Lo: the E[arl] of E[ssex],' *beginning* 'There was a time when seely bees could speake,' and (on 'The fickle state of our uncertayn life') 'What if a day.'" It would seem that Mr. Clark has relied on this remark. At least the librarian informs me that "the poem is on f. 10*v* and f. 11; is not headed by any attribution, and that the verses attributed to the E. of E. are on f. 9 and in a different hand." The earl of Essex lived from 1567–1601 so that, even if the note also referred to "What if a Day," "written by the E. of E." can only mean "copied by the E. of E.," or else must be considered as a faulty statement, as the same reason that prevents us from considering Campion as the author also prevents us from considering the earl of Essex as such.

In itself the version is a very interesting one. It will be seen at a glance that it differs from all others in counting four stanzas; all other versions have two, three, five or more.

Stanza i belongs to the group beginning "What if a day, a month or a year," and to that having in the fifth line "Fortune, honour, beauty, youth." It agrees closely with the version in Farr's *Select Poetry* (No. XI of my paper), as does stanza ii. So far there is nothing striking; Stanza iii, however, also agrees with the version in Farr's *Select Poetry*, and occurs nowhere else, while

Stanza iv is like the third stanza in *Rich. Wigley's Commonplace Book*, only differing slightly in the last lines. To recapitulate: our version is, leaving out of account a few minor variants, identical with Farr's version (which itself differs from all others in bringing a new third stanza), but adds a fourth stanza which up to now has only been found in *Rich. Wigley's Commonplace Book*.

Evidently there is a parody on "What if a Day" in "A Droll," printed on p. 41 of *Merry Drollery, Complete*, edited by T. Woodfall Ebsworth, 1875. Its closing lines are:

Let us sing, let us laugh;
Let us drink, let us quaff;
See the world is sliding,
Here is no abiding,
Our life's but a Hollyday.

Groningen A. E. H. Swaen

(f. 10*b*)

The Fickle Estate of Our
Vncertayn Lyfe to A
Pleasaunt New Tune.

What if a day or A moneth or a yeare
Crowne thy delightes
with a thowsand wisht contentinges?
May not the chaunce of A night or an houre
Crosse those delightes,
With as many sad tormentinges?
Ffortune, honor, beuty, youth,
Are but blossomes dying:
Wanton pleasures doteing love,
Are but shadowes flying,
All our ioyes are but toyes
Idle thoughtes deceyueing,
None haue powre in an houre
Of our lyves bereaueing.

The earth is but A poynt of ye world, & A man
Is but a poynte
Of the earthes[1] compared Center
Shall then a poynt of A poynt be soe vayne

[1] ?es. Blot in MS.

As to triumph
In a[1] seely pointes Adventure.
All is hazard that we haue,
There is nothing bydeing:
Dayes of pleasures are but streames,
Through fayre meddowes glideinge.
Weale or woe time doth goe
In tyme ther's noe returninge,
Secret fates guyde our states
Both in mirth and mourninge.

(f. 11) What shall A man desyre in this worlde
Seing ther's naught,
In this world, that is worth desyreing!
Let not a man cast his eyes to the earth,
But to the heavens
With his thoughtes high aspyring.
Thinke that liveing thou must dye,
Be assured thy dayes be told:
Though on earth thou seemest to bee
Assure thy self thou art but molde.
All our wealth bringes noe health,
But returnes from whome it came;
Soe shall we all agree,
If we be the very same.

Goe seely note to ye eares of my deare,
Make thy self blest
And in swetest passions languish.
Lay thee to sleepe on the brest of her harte
Giue her delight,
Though thy self be made of Anguish.
There where thou arte then speake of mee
That from thence am banisht:
Saye that once I had content,
Though that it be vanisht.
Yet when tyme doth runne backe,
And tyme passed doth renne;
She shall cease to be fayre
And I will liue to be true.

Finis

[1] Canceled in MS.

THE BANISHED WIFE'S LAMENT

The company of ladies in Anglo-Saxon poetry is not a large one. If Judith, Elene, and other heroines from foreign lands are left out of consideration, their number is small indeed. This is of course due in large measure to the fact that a relatively small amount of poetry based upon Germanic themes has been preserved. If woman plays a minor part in *Beowulf*, one of the *Waldhere* fragments gives a hint that the case may have been otherwise in some of the epic material that has perished. It is doubtful if the dramatic intensity of such figures as Brunnhild or Gudrun in the poetic *Edda* would have been paralleled in the less impassioned West Germanic verse, but it seems likely that the emotions of women would have interested poets who could depict so graphically the feelings of men like the Wanderer or the Seafarer. And there are, as is well known, illustrations of this interest in the woman's point of view in the Anglo-Saxon lyrics. The most conspicuous of these illustrations is the poem generally known as the *Banished Wife's Lament*.[1] Here the whole emphasis is thrown upon the element of love. Oppressed by profound grief, the wife briefly reviews her unhappy career, bewails her present desolate situation, and ends with a cry of despair surprisingly modern in its intensity.

The piece is an unusually significant one. Its sustained passion, its well-rounded form, and its vivid portrayal of a dramatic situation give it an important place in Anglo-Saxon poetry. Like so much of the minor verse, however, it is far from being easy of comprehension. There is much in the language which offers difficulty, and the larger questions of the interpretation of the whole, and its possible connection with incidents of heroic saga, are not easily disposed of. The lady has succeeded in throwing over her tale something of the obscurity of her gloomy abode in the forest. As to her present unhappy condition there can be no doubt, but her lamentations give no very clear idea of the series of

[1] Or *Complaint*. Grein-Wülker, "Klage der Frau," *Bibliothek der ags. Poesie*, Vol. I, pp. 302 ff.

distressful strokes in her past history. There is, then, in addition to the literary merit of the piece, all the fascination of a problem, or a series of problems, and scholars have not failed to attack these with energy and patience. But the results of these investigations have often been radically dissimilar. Indeed, a review of critical opinion from the beginning shows a considerable lack of unanimity all along the line, and confirms the impression that the last word about the poem has not yet been spoken.[1]

The purpose of the following notes is to call attention to the translation of certain passages which appear to have been generally misunderstood, and to consider the probable explanation of the whole situation, which is only vaguely outlined in the poem. For the sake of brevity, detailed references to the work of previous investigators have generally been omitted, excepting where a special examination of their theories seems profitable.

Our first duty appears to be the rehabilitation of the character of the husband of the unfortunate lady. True, she says that he has banished her into the woods, but this is a matter in which she may have been deceived, as we shall see. It is more important to look at the passage following, in which she is held to accuse him of treacherously masking murderous thoughts under the pretense of friendliness—as Trautmann puts it—"die verse . . . . in denen die frau bejammert einen seine gedanken verhehlenden und auf mord sinnenden gemahl gefunden zu haben."[2]

Forþon is mīn hyge gēomor,
ðā ic mē ful gemæcne monnan funde,
heardsǣligne, hygegēomorne,
mōd mīþendne, morþor hycgend(n)e,
blīþe gebǣro. Ful oft wit bēotedan
þæt unc ne gedǣlde nemne dēað āna
ōwiht elles; eft is þæt onhworfen!
is nū swā hit nō wǣre,
frēondscipe uncer.[3]

Do not the characteristics set forth in ll. 19–21 explain the

[1] For a review of critical opinion, see Wülker, *Grundriss der ags. Litteratur*, pp. 224–26; Schücking, *Zeitschrift f. deutsches Alterthum*, Vol. XLVIII, pp. 436 ff.

[2] *Anglia*, Vol. XVI, p. 223. Miss Edith Rickert, *Modern Philology*, Vol. II, p. 366, n. 4, gives a similar meaning to the passage. See also Roeder, *loc. cit.*, below.

[3] The text is that of the Grein-Wülker *Bibliothek*, with the addition of the vowel-quantities, and some changes in punctuation.

phrase *ful gemœcne?* And are they not virtues, at least according to Anglo-Saxon conceptions, and not the reverse? The correct translation would, I believe, run something as follows: "And so my heart is sad, since I (had) found a man well suited to me, one who had experienced misfortune, serious-minded, concealing his feelings, mindful of death, of pleasant demeanor." The husband was congenial in the first place, because he had, like her, known misfortune. Trouble has been her companion since her youth (ll. 2–4), and the man who also had known the uses of adversity might well be in sympathy with her. The adjective *hygegēomor* seems to describe the effect of misfortune upon the character of the man—"sad (or, more probably, *serious*) of thought."

This word *hygegēomor*, as well as the rest of the passage, can perhaps best be explained in connection with ll. 42–45.

> Ā scyle geong mon wesan gēomormōd,
> heard heortan geþoht, swylce habban sceal
> blīþe gebǣro, ēac þon brēostceare,
> sinsorgna gedrēag.

Leaving the interpretation of ll. 17–21 for a moment, let us consider the meaning of this section of the poem. Here, too, I believe that critics have been astray. Roeder,[1] for example, understands this and what follows as a series of imprecations; here "ruft die Frau Verwünschungen herab" upon a nameless young man who is involved in an intrigue which has caused the separation of husband and wife. There appears to be no reason for introducing a third person into the story. The main thing to notice at present is that the lines are only a series of reflections of a general character—one of those moralizing incursions into poetry of which the Anglo-Saxons were so fond. "Ever ought a young man to be serious of mind, steadfast the thoughts of his heart, (he should have) a pleasant demeanor as well, also care, the weight of constant anxiety." This train of thought, although beginning in the conventional, abstract manner, is obviously suggested by the man whom the lady has ever in mind, the man of whom she speaks openly again in ll. 47*b* ff., her husband.

[1] For Roeder's interesting and ingenious, though unconvincing interpretation, see his monograph, "Die Familie bei den Angelsachsen," in Morsbach's *Studien zur engl. Philologie*, No. 4, pp. 112–19.

It is unnecessary to emphasize the fact that Anglo-Saxon poets frequently turn aside from the matter in hand, both in the epic and the lyric, to introduce moral reflections suggested by the situation. The Wanderer forgets his personal misfortunes for a time, and reviews at some length the characteristics which should distinguish a prudent man.[1] The *Seafarer* affords a curious parallel, in a didactic passage,[2] to the use of the two forms *sceal* and *scyle* in the lines above. In Old Norse the passion for pointing a moral is fully as strong. In the *Sigrdrifumǫ́l*, for instance, Sigrdrifa (Brunnhild), after having been awakened by Sigurd on the fire-encircled mountain, proceeds to reward the hero with a series of moral precepts. In the *Hǫvamǫ́l* this material constitutes the chief interest. The considerable amount of gnomic verse in Anglo-Saxon affords many parallels to the passage under discussion. Consider the word *gēomormōd*. One virtue frequently emphasized was a proper realization of the serious future. A young man ought to have his mind on other than trivial subjects. The wise father instructs his son:

> Seldan snottor guma sorglēas blissað,
> swylce dol seldon drȳmeð sorgful
> ymb his forðgesceaft, nefne hē fæhþe wite.[3]

The upshot of this clearly is that the wise man seldom gives himself up to unrestrained joy—it is not well to be *sorglēas*, constant seriousness is desirable; while the foolish man is seldom plunged into gloomy thoughts about the future, unless he is in some present trouble. The condition of the world, the transitory character of human things, dwelt upon by the Wanderer and the Seafarer, go to make a man's disposition sober.

> For þon ic geþencan ne mæg geond þās woruld
> for hwan mōdsefa mīn ne gesweorce,[4]

is the cry. I take *gēomormōd*, then, to express this due sense of the seriousness of life, and *hygegēomorne* to have a similar meaning. Compare the Elizabethan word *sad*. *Brēostceare* and *sinsorgna gedrēag* form poetic repetitions of *gēomormōd*. After the caution that a young man should be of cheerful exterior, the

[1] Ll. 65 ff. [2] Ll. 109 ff.
[3] "Des Vaters Lehren," Grein-Wülker *Bibliothek*, p. 355, ll. 54-56.
[4] *Wanderer*, ll. 58 f.

moralizer hastens again to drive home the main lesson. Yet it was none the less a virtue to be amiable. The wise father, in the course of his moral instructions, utters the warning: "ac bēo lēofwende!"[1] Evidently a seriousness which manifested itself in a gloomy demeanor was as much of a mistake as frivolity.

We shall take up this passage again later, in connection with what follows. It will be noticed that the parallelism to ll. 17 ff. is striking. In those the lady grieves that she has had to lose a man who was serious, self-restrained, and prepared for calamity, yet cheerful. The same phrase, *blīþe gebǣro*, occurs in each passage, and *hygegēomor* is much like *gēomormōd*.

Let us now consider l. 20, *mōd mīþendne, morþor hycgend(n)e*. The wise man keeps his thoughts to himself, which is the virtue brought out in *mōd mīþendne*. The father's instructions, from which quotations have already been made, are again in point:

> Wærwyrde sceal wīsfæst hæle
> brēostum hycgan, nales breahtme hlūd.[2]

The Bosworth-Toller lexicon renders the unusual word *wærwyrde* "cautious of speech." The general sense is in any case plain. The *Wanderer*, too, offers a good parallel:

> Ic tō sōþe wāt
> þæt biþ in eorle indryhten þēaw
> þæt hē his ferðlocan fæste binde,
> healde his hordcofan, hycge swā hē wille.[3]

Other citations are hardly necessary. The phrase *morþor hycgendne*, however, requires more attention. I believe it may have been universally misunderstood in this passage. I take it to mean "meditating upon death," and not "brooding over murder," *mord sinnend* (Roeder).[4] The similarity of certain Anglo-Saxon words to their representatives in modern English and German occasionally blinds us to differences in their meaning. "Murder" means nowadays "intentional and unlawful homicide."[5] But the use of the term *morþor* in early days was much less specialized. It meant, apparently, any kind of violent death. Its use in

[1] L. 92. [2] Ll. 57, 58. [3] Ll. 11–14.

[4] "Wir bekommen nicht zu wissen, welche Ränke die Sippe des Mannes übte. Sollte sie ihn vielleicht zu einem Morde angestiftet oder ihn so gereizt haben, dass er einen Angehörigen seines eigenen Geschlechts erschlug?" Roeder, p. 114.

[5] Webster's *International Dictionary*.

Beowulf illustrates perfectly the fact that the modern word "murder" will not always serve as a translation. Grendel is spoken of (l. 683) as *morþres scyldig*, although killed in a fair fight. The purely accidental slaying of Herebeald by Haethcyn is referred to thus:

> Wæs þām yldestan ungedēfelīce
> mæges dǣdum morþor-bed strēd.[1]

The citations which have already been given à propos of the word *gēomormōd* are again in point here. Meditation upon one's latter end cannot fail to induce seriousness. Nothing in the text justifies giving an adversative meaning to *blīþe gebǣro*, and translating "holding murder in his thoughts, yet so blithe of bearing," as Stopford Brooke does.[2] Of course the rendering "murder" is not absolutely impossible, since that was one of the ways to meet a violent end. But the word as it stands is not so specialized in meaning, and unless something hitherto undiscovered is revealed in the context to justify that rendering, it gives a false impression of the passage. In days when a man was as constantly beset by peril as he was in the eighth century, it was well to have the possibility of a sudden end in mind, in whatever form that might come.

The husband emerges from the ordeal of a rigid examination of the lines, then, not only unscathed, but with added virtues to his credit. We may now briefly consider an attack recently made upon the personality of the unfortunate lady, which is no less than an attempt to prove that the piece does not depict the sorrows of a woman at all. Upon a hasty review, this revolutionary theory sounds plausible, especially as the author, Dr. L. L. Schücking,[3] has incidentally made comments upon the text, some of which are entirely sound. But the more closely the hypothesis is examined, the more evident its untenability becomes. It is not wholly a new one; the earliest editors were of the opinion that a man must be regarded as the protagonist. This was due to

[1] *Bēow.*, ll. 2435–6. The Heyne-Socin glossary defines *morþor* as "gewaltsame Tötung, Mord," but is not equally careful in defining the compounds. The meaning of the word is further extended to "torment, injury," or sins of various kinds, even adultery. See Grein's *Sprachschatz*, and the Bosworth-Toller lexicon.

[2] *History of Early English Literature*, p. 360.

[3] For Schücking's article, see n. 1 above, p. 388.

defective knowledge of Anglo-Saxon, however, or to failure to notice the feminine terminations which indicate the sex of the speaker. Dr. Schücking thinks he finds a way to get rid of these troublesome endings, and adds many other reasons to support his view. Before we can allow the unhappy lady to have another woe added to her store by being put out of existence altogether, in the pages of the *Zeitschrift für deutsches Alterthum*, it may be well to show briefly how strong is her defense, and how weak the case of her adversary. So much seems to be demanded by gallantry, if not by scholarship.

A most serious objection to Schücking's view presents itself at the very outset—the feminine endings just mentioned.

> Ic þis giedd wrece bī mē ful gēomorre,
> mīnre sylfre sīð; ic þæt secgan mæg,
> hwæt ic yrmþa gebād, sīþþan ic ūp wēox,
> nīwes oþþe ealdes, nō mā þonne nū;
> ā ic wīte wonn mīnra wræcsīþa!

Schücking acknowledges that *gēomorre* and *mīnre sylfre* cannot be explained away as lapses due to the scribe, and properly rejects Thorpe's high-handed restoration of the masculine forms. But his method of disposing of the case is hardly less arbitrary. He thinks that these two lines, at least in their present form, are not original, since feminine inflections applying to the speaker do not elsewhere occur, and suggests that the last man who dealt with the poem in its original form misunderstood the situation, and either inserted the feminine forms instead of the masculine, or else prefixed the two lines in question to the poem as he found it. The latter hypothesis he thinks more probable, since the meter in 1*b* requires the feminine termination. The piece perhaps began originally, he maintains, as follows:

> Hwæt! ic yrmþa gebād, siþþan ic ūp āwēox,
> nīwra oþþe ealdra nō mā þonne nū.

Textual errors occur in various places, and he calls upon the patchwork theory to help out his case. "Wie vielleicht auch die zusammensetzung des Wanderers dartut (vgl. Boer, *Z. f. d. Ph.*, 35, 1 ff., nicht in allen punkten überzeugend), haben wir es

bei den im *Exeterbuch* überlieferten lyr. gedichten nicht mit einer reinen überlieferung zu tun."[1]

To attribute to misunderstanding or interpolation the two lines which absolutely contradict the theory is practically to beg the whole question. Schücking sees in the addition of the first two lines a "lyric tradition," and compares the opening of the *Seafarer*. But if the hypothetical beginning of the piece, *Hwæt! ic yrmþa gebād*, etc., is as natural as he finds it, would it have been necessary to prefix the two opening lines, when this lyric tradition is only occasionally observed? Suppose, for the sake of argument, we grant that the lines were added later. We should then have to assume that the redactor intended *þæt* to refer to *giedd*, and so placed a full stop after the end of l. 2. This seems improbable—*giedd secgan* is unusual, at least. Moreover, this would leave *nīwes oþþe ealdes* without other antecedent than *yrmþa*, which is feminine. It will be observed that Schücking, in his reconstruction of the old beginning of the piece, changes this phrase to *nīwra oþþe ealdra*. It might be conjectured, on the other hand, that the reviser ingeniously altered *hwæt* from an interjection to a pronoun, its antecedent being *þæt* (l. 2), which is the accepted construction of the lines today, and also that he gave the present form to the first half of l. 4. This is much like the processes of Boer, in the article to which Schücking alludes. I have already criticized those arguments elsewhere, both in matters of detail and of method. Anyone who believes that the *Wanderer* is a composite of the sort that Boer makes it out to be will have little difficulty in regarding these first two lines as an excrescence to be lopped off at will. No one will deny that there are many textual errors in the lyrics, but that these are necessarily evidences of divided authorship or of editorial revision I see no reason to believe.

These observations apply equally well to the alternative theory, that the first two lines were not prefixed, but merely altered. The whole idea that some man who recast the piece misunderstood its meaning makes argument almost impossible. If we cannot take

[1] P. 447. For a review of Boer's work, cf. article by the present writer in the *Journal of Germanic Philology*, Vol. IV, pp. 460-80.

the plain evidence of grammatical forms for what it signifies, we might as well forsake all reasoning from the known facts the poem affords. The men who perpetuated it in Anglo-Saxon times must have had at least as good an idea of its meaning as we, and the presumption is all in favor of their having had a better.

Schücking lays much stress upon the word *leodfruma*[1] (l. 8), emphasizing the fact that it does not mean "husband" but "prince," which no one will dispute for a moment. But he seems to think it strange that a noble lady should speak of her husband as her "lord," although he admits that Wealhtheow addresses Hrothgar as *freo-drihten mīn*, and that *sin-frēa* is likewise used of a husband, *Beow.*, 1170. Why is not the analogy of such words as *drihten* or *frēa* perfect? Here too the original meaning is not "husband," yet they are clearly used of a lord in this relation. Perhaps a quotation from Roeder's investigation of the Anglo-Saxon family will clear up this matter most quickly. It will be observed that Roeder is not making these statements in connection with this particular poem. "Der Mann erscheint als der Herr und Gebieter der Frau: *Gen.*, 2225 nennt Sarah ihren Gatten *drihten mīn!* oder er heisst ihr *man-drihten*, 2242 . . . . 2729 *frēa-drihten*, ebenfalls von Abraham. 2783 apostrophiert ihn Sarah: *mīn swæs frēa!* . . . . Es lässt sich also auch hier bemerken, dass man die eheliche Gemeinschaft als ein Komitatsverhältniss ansieht . . . . Einmal wird in den Rätseln 62.4 der Mann sogar der "holde" Herr der Frau genannt: *holdum þēodne.*"[2] Other examples might be cited.[3] The common later English usage makes it seem entirely natural for an Anglo-Saxon lady to have addressed her husband as her lord. Schücking admits: "An sich ist dies wohl nicht absolut ausgeschlossen . . . . immerhin gibt diese stelle im verein mit dem folgenden zu denken,"[4] proceeding then to other arguments. But if this point has no weight, it cannot support subsequent proofs. In logic, as in mathematics, $X+0=X$, and no more. There is no chain of reasoning more fallacious than that built of separate arguments each of which amounts to nothing in itself.

[1] P. 438. [2] Roeder, *loc. cit.*, pp. 109, f.
[3] *Genesis*, l. 655; *Bēow.*, l. 641; *Gnom. Exon.*, l. 91.
[4] P. 440.

Nothing in ll. 9, 10 makes it improbable that the speaker is a woman, although we are told they are "von der grössten wichtigkeit." Schücking is probably right in translating *folgað sēcan* "gefolgschaftsdienst zu suchen." As for the phrase *winelēas wrœcca*, there is no reason why it may not apply to a woman as well as to a man; cf. *Dohtor se Babiloinisca wrœcca, filia Babiloinis misera, Ps. Lamb.*, 136, 8. Yet upon this point Schücking lays great stress, not stating it quite exactly; "damit ist nun der wichtigste punkt für die erklärung des gedichts berührt: kann der sprecher der von sich sagt, dass er als freundloser 'recke' neue gefolgschaft suche eine frau sein? ich halte es für unmöglich."[1] But the word *wrœcca* does not mean "recke," it means "der umherirrende heimatlose," as Schücking himself says. He admits, too, that the expression may be used of a woman entering service in a foreign land. But this, he says, is "unwahrscheinlich." Why? Such incidents are common in early story.[2] All this is worth no more than the *lēodfruma* argument, as far as proof goes. Similarly, *frēondscipe* (l. 25) may certainly be used of the love of a man and woman, cf. *frēondmynd, cogitationes amatoriae, Gen.*, 1830, 1831; *frēond-rœ̄den(n), conditio amatoria, Jul.*, 34, 71, etc.[3] But Schücking remarks: "*frēondscipe* mit Roeder als 'liebesbund' zu übersetzen, liegt kein grund vor. vgl. *frynd* v. 33." What the point of this reference is does not appear. Of course the dual form *uncer* disposes of any idea that *frēondscipe* may refer to the relation between others than the speaker and the *mon* of l. 18.

Moreover, Schücking's interpretation involves much shifting of subject. *þœs monnes* (l. 11) is not the same person as *mīn lēodfruma* (l. 8), although there is no intimation of any other man's coming into the narrative except what one may imagine in *folgað sēcan*. The person whose kinsmen are plotting to estrange him from the speaker is not the one whom the speaker has men-

[1] P. 440.

[2] Miss M. R. Cox, in treating the variants of the Cinderella-story, enumerates many instances of the "menial heroine" incident (*Publications of the Folk-Lore Society, XXXI*). Cf. especially her Preface. "Numberless instances," she says, "might be adduced in which a hero or heroine must undergo a term of servitude before fulfilling an exalted destiny" (p. xl).

[3] Cf. Roeder, p. 95.

tioned with tenderness in l. 7; the *hlāford mīn* of l. 15 is not the *mīn hlāford* of l. 6. Another shift comes in l. 18. The *ful gemæcne monnan* is not the *mon* of l. 11, the new lord to whom our attention has supposedly been diverted, but lord number one is introduced without any indication that a change has been made. It is scarcely conceivable that anyone reading or hearing this for the first time would interpret the situation as Schücking imagines it, unless the outlines of the story were familiar. There are shifts of subject in early poetry, but nothing quite so wild as this.

It is hardly worth while to examine these arguments further. Other errors might be pointed out,[1] but enough has been said to lead to a safe conclusion. There is no valid evidence that the speaker must be a man and cannot be a woman, while there are the best of reasons for holding that the speaker must be a woman and cannot be a man.

More interesting to the general reader, and more important for literary history and aesthetic criticism is the question of what the interpretation of the poem as a whole shall be. What is the story, obscurely shadowed forth, which it tells?

It is a difficult problem to solve—an impossible one, I believe, unless one looks beyond the limits of the text. There is so much in the language that admits of varied translation that it is hardly surprising that there has never been any unanimity about the underlying plot. Even if an exact and literal translation could be agreed upon, it is highly doubtful if it would be possible to reconstruct from this the situation as the poet conceived it. Moreover, in a poem of lyrical character a detailed and circumstantial narrative cannot be expected. It seems likely that three or four hypothetical plots might be proposed, none of which would be inconsistent with the text, because so much allowance must in any case be made for the omissions in the story. The interpretation of the piece as it stands, with all its ambiguities upon its head, is ten times more difficult. And if it is obscure to the lynx-eyed modern investigator, who reads it over and over again, and weighs

[1] Cf. n. 2, p. 403, below; *on þissum londstede*, l. 16, does not appear to mean that the speaker is living "im neuen lande," but rather in the country of the *hlāford* of l. 6, who departed *heonan of lēodum; āhte*, too, is preterit. Does *on eorþan* (l. 33) mean "fern"? (Schücking, p. 441).

the evidence of each detail with minute care, would it not have confused the people for whom it was originally composed? What would a listening throng have made of it, if they had been obliged to evolve the story for themselves?

Assume, on the other hand, that we are dealing with a lyric treatment of some theme familiar to everyone in Anglo-Saxon times, and these difficulties vanish. With the general course of events already in mind, an audience could have understood and appreciated the telling of the tale, and the minstrel would have been unhampered in bringing out its pathos and its passion. And this proceeding was just what such an audience would have expected. Nothing was commoner than for the poet to touch only upon certain moments in a story and suppress others, as suited his artistic purpose. Certain situations are thus thrown into high relief, as in the poetic *Edda*. But unless the audience knows the story, this procedure is impossible. The *Wife's Lament* may well be like certain episodes in *Beowulf*—the Finn-episode, for instance, a narrative the true course of which can only be guessed at from the lines as they stand. Unfortunately, the story of Finn has not been preserved in other sources, but there is reason to think that we are more fortunate in the present case. At all events, whether one believes a priori that the poem is based upon *heldensage* or not, it is clear that one cannot properly interpret any piece of Anglo-Saxon verse by focusing his gaze upon it alone, and disregarding all the material in song and story which it recalls today, and which it must have suggested even more to a man of the eighth century.

Identification of the events here narrated with those of some heroic tale has already been proposed several times, but never worked out in a wholly convincing way. Nor has the relation of the Anglo-Saxon lyric in general to material of this sort been satisfactorily treated. Ten Brink's statement that it is improbable that such relations exist[1]—with the exception of *Deor's Lament*—has frequently been quoted, and deserves all consideration, as coming from so high an authority. Miss Rickert, in the article already alluded to, disagrees with him, and argues at some length

[1] *History of English Literature*, transl. Kennedy, Vol. I, p. 61.

for the identification of this poem with the Offa-saga.[1] Her monograph is careful and complete, yet exception may be taken to some of her observations upon this particular poem, and especially to some of her conclusions regarding the lyric. Let us first consider the general situation, and then the claims of the Offa-saga to be a key unlocking the mystery of the misfortunes of the distressed wife.

It seems evident, upon careful examination, that no such statement as ten Brink's, that the Anglo-Saxon lyrics are or are not based upon *heldensage*, will serve. In three of these, the *Wanderer*, the *Seafarer*, and the *Ruin*, it appears to play no part. In three others, the *Banished Wife's Lament*, the *Husband's Message*, and *Signy's Lament* (the First Riddle), the very backbone of the dramatic structure is in all probability a well-known heroic tale. In two others the connection is of a different sort. Widsith—if we may include his story under lyric verse—cites famous warriors as his patrons with unblushing insouciance, in one instance introducing himself in a circumstantial way at the courts of Eormanric and Eadgils.[2] But he deals with names, not with situations. The interest of his tale is that of a catalogue, in the main. What little story there is in the poem is his own, not that of the heroes whom he has seen. Again, Deor, in his lament, fortifies his heart in adversity by recalling the misfortunes of famous personages. Here, too, the connection is external. Incidents of saga have nothing to do with his troubles except as affording parallels.

It will be observed, then, that the Anglo-Saxon lyrics are not all of a similar character as regards plot, for it is here that the distinction must be made. In the *Wanderer* the events narrated are simple. The exile's lord has died; he has been forced to seek a new one. This is all; the interest of the poem depends not upon the events of the Wanderer's life, but upon his description of the effects of exile and the decay of the fair things of the world upon the heart. There is no need to turn to saga to explain all this, and the situation is too vague and general to permit of satisfactory

[1] *Modern Philology*, Vol. II, pp. 365 ff.

[2] Cf. article by the present writer, *Modern Philology*, Vol. IV, No. 2.

identification. The *Seafarer* shows even less "plot" than the *Wanderer*. No train of events is narrated. A sailor contrasts the hardships of voyaging with the security of life upon shore, yet emphasizes the mysterious call of the sea. As for the *Ruin*, it was obviously inspired by the remains of some city, the name of which it would be interesting to know, but this is not necessary to the enjoyment of the piece, and there is nothing to suggest connection with the *heldensage* about this bit of realistic description.

On the other hand, the *Husband's Message*, the so-called First Riddle—not a riddle at all, but a dramatic soliloquy—and the poem at present under discussion are very different. Here, despite the "lyric cry," there is obviously a very definite and somewhat involved story underlying the whole, a story not clearly set forth, but one which must be understood if the piece is to be fully appreciated. These three poems seem, then, to stand entirely apart from the rest in this regard. Moreover, they have all been connected with familiar old stories, and the resemblances seem too strong to be purely fortuitous. Following the demonstration that the First Riddle contains Scandinavianisms which indicate connection with Old Norse,[1] Professor Schofield pointed out the striking likeness to a situation in the *Volsungasaga*, and renamed it *Signy's Lament*.[2] He has also noted that the *Husband's Message* is much like an episode of the Tristram saga, which appears to have been current in England in early times,[3] and has promised an article upon this subject. The parallelism between the *Wife's Lament* and certain parts of the Offa-saga—or, if one prefers, the Constance-saga—is remarkable, especially when certain resemblances not hitherto noted are considered.

Miss Rickert suggests that the lyric poems may have formed portions of lost epics. This affords an opportunity for interesting speculation, but in the scarcity of surviving epic material, no ground for satisfactory conclusions. There seems to be no reason why the *giedd* or short monologue of the epic should not have been current in isolated form as well, or even have been preserved after

[1] *Publications of the Modern Language Association*, Vol. XVII, pp. 247 ff.
[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 262 ff.
[3] *English Literature from the Norman Conquest to Chaucer*, p. 202.

the longer poem had passed out of memory, since an epic was to men of early days a necklace the pearls of which might be detached at will. And when lyric interludes in stichic verse formed a part of epic poems, there would have been no incongruity in giving this form to similar pieces having no direct connection with longer works. But it is hard to see how Miss Rickert can see in the *Wanderer* and the *Seafarer* "a definite dramatic situation the details of which are more or less obscure,"[1] and believe that a definite saga-episode must have been in the poet's mind. The point seems to be that the whole is indefinite. Any exile in the conventional position of the Wanderer, any sailor who has experienced the strange fascination of the sea may be the protagonist. It is easy to pick out moments in various sagas to which the experiences of these men apply—Miss Rickert suggests two for each poem—but nothing leads to satisfactory identification. On the other hand, consider the *Husband's Message* or the *Wife's Lament*. Any woman banished into a wood or any husband or lover writing to his lady will not satisfy the demands of the situation. There is of course no way of proving that the poet of the *Wanderer* or the *Seafarer* may not have had saga-figures in mind, but there is nothing to show that such was the case. They may be explained and enjoyed as typical figures; the others may not.

In the absence of documentary evidence, it seems equally impossible to prove that the *Banished Wife's Lament* is or is not based on the Offa-saga. The question is rather whether the resemblances in incident and mood are sufficiently close, and whether such facts as have been determined in regard to the early history of the Offa material render the hypothesis a likely one. It should not be forgotten that the general reasons stated above for assuming a saga-basis for the poem will still hold, even if the particular identification here reviewed be rejected.

It is not the design of the present paper to give a summary of the arguments which point to this relationship with the Offa-saga. For this the reader is referred to Miss Rickert's monograph, and to Gough's discussion of the Constance-saga in *Palæstra XXIII*. The twelfth-century *Vita Offæ Primi*, which Miss Rickert uses

[1] P. 371.

as the basis of her work, deserves careful attention as the earliest elaborated account, and doubtless preserves many details of the story as it existed in the eighth century, but various changes and additions must have taken place in the four centuries intervening, for many of which the fusion with the Offa II-Cynethryth material is doubtless responsible. While Gough's reconstruction of the hypothetical primitive form shows certain elements which must have been prominent in early times, no extant version reproduces the tale as it existed when this lyric was probably written.

There is no doubt, however, that the story of the shadowy Anglian king Offa, blended with *märchen* elements, was well known in England in the time of Cynewulf. Some details in regard to him are familiar from *Beowulf* and *Widsith*, and both Suchier[1] and Gough agree in locating the earliest form of the saga in Anglian territory. Everything goes to show that it would have been entirely natural for the author of this lyric to have used the saga as literary material. The resemblances of incident are thus fortified by the inherent probability of such borrowing.

These resemblances, if accidental, are remarkable. The heroine's early years of misfortune and exile, her husband's departure, the hostility of his kinsfolk, her banishment into a wilderness at his orders—all this is quite in keeping with the account in the saga. The narrative element, however, soon becomes subordinated to the lyric complaints. Certain passages for which I would suggest another interpretation than Miss Rickert's have already been discussed. It remains to explain the closing lines, which she has had difficulty in reconciling with the earlier part of the poem and with the saga itself. There is a strong resemblance to the *Vita* here which she has failed to note.

The translation of ll. 42–53, as I understand them, runs as follows:

Ever ought a young man to be serious of mind, steadfast the thoughts of his heart, (he should have) a pleasant demeanor as well, also care, the weight of constant anxiety, whether[2] he have achieved all his worldly

[1] "Über die Sage von Offa und Dryþo," Paul-Braune *Beiträge*, Vol. IV, p. 521.

[2] I should accept Schücking's explanation of *sy . . . . sy*. *Gelong* means literally, "proceeding from, dependent upon." Cf. mod. colloquial "along of." The contrast in the lines that between a successful and an unfortunate man — to paraphrase, "whether he have as

joy, or be far and wide surrounded by hostility[1] in a far-distant land—where[2] my friend[3] sitteth beneath the rocky cliff, beaten by the storm, weary-hearted, drenched with water in his dreary hall! He endureth mighty sorrow; he remembereth too oft a more joyful dwelling. Woe is his who must in longing await the coming of a dear one!

It is important to recollect that we are getting the story from the woman's point of view, that she does not know the real state of affairs. Vaguely she feels that her husband's relatives are at the bottom of the trouble, but cannot particularize. The forged order of banishment has brought, in addition to her physical sufferings, the agony of supposing that her husband is estranged from her. More than this, the false letter contained the news of the king's defeat and of his imminent peril.[4] So she has also to bear the thought that he is now among victorious enemies. This explains the closing lines. After the lyric elaboration of ll. 29–41, her thoughts turn to the qualities of the ideal man, whether he be fortunate or be *ful wīde fāh feorres folclondes*, which she supposes

a result of his efforts all the joy that can be his on earth, or be hunted down in a foreign land, he should still be mindful of the future life." Perhaps the implication is that the lady's husband was lacking in this high seriousness.

[1] *Fāh* means literally "proscribed."

[2] I read *þǣr* (Thorpe, Ettmüller) instead of *þæt*. One wonders how Schücking would translate the entire passage, especially how he reconciles ll. 43, 44, and 45*a* with his conception. In his paraphrase he completely ignores them: "denn ein junger mann (wie ich) muss immer traurig sein, ob es ihm selbst nun gut geht oder böse, wenn es seinem herrn so schlecht geht, wie dem meinen." This really gives a false idea of the train of thought. The construction of *þæt*, (l. 47) is in any case harsh as the text stands. Schücking takes it as a conjunction referring to *gēomormōd*, five lines back, with another independent clause, *swylce habban sceal blīþe gebǣro*, etc., and the "alternative hypothesis" ll. 45, 46 intervening. This is surely a good deal of a strain, "grammatisch . . . . ein wenig aus der rolle gefallen," indeed. The meaning seems to be, on this hypothesis, that the young man is not only sad, but resolute of heart and of blithe exterior because his lord is faring so badly. The passage intervening between *gēomormōd* and *þæt* is not parenthetical in form, and it is difficult to see how it can be in sense.

[3] *Wine*, as well as *frēond*, may mean "husband;" cf. Bosworth-Toller.

[4] Cf. *Originals and Analogues*, Chaucer Soc., Vol. I, pp. 71–84, for a reprint of the *Vita*. The text of the forged letter is as follows: "Rex Offa, majoribus et præcipuis regni sui, salutis et prosperitatis augmentum; universitati vestræ notum facio, in itinere, quod arripui, infortunia et adversa plurima tam mihi quam subditis meis accidisse, et majores exercitus mei, non ignava propria, vel hostium oppugnantium virtute, sed potius peccatis nostris justo Dei judicio interiisse. Ego autem instantis periculi causam pertractans, et conscientiæ meæ intima perscrutatus, in metemipso nihil aliud conjicio altissimo displicere, nisi quod perditam et maleficam illam absque meorum consensu, uxorem imperito et infelici duxi matrimonio: Ut ergo de malefica memorata, voluntati vestræ ad plenum quam temere offendi, satisfiat, asportetur cum liberis ex ea genitis ad loca deserta, hominibus incognita, feris et avibus aut sylvestribus prædonibus frequentata; ubi cum pueris suis puerpera truncata manus et pedes exemplo pereat inaudito."

is the condition of her lord at the present moment, and this in turn brings the direct mention of him, overcome by his foes in the rainy and dreary Scottish country. The keynote of the poem, expressed in the last two lines, applies equally well to husband or wife.

Two objections to this identification should be considered. Wülker finds it strange that the child or children mentioned in the saga are not alluded to in the lyric.[1] Miss Rickert replies: "But these in V[1] play no part except as they are connected with the foundation of St. Albans." It ought to be added at this point that this did not take place until the latter part of the eighth century, the foundation being due to the repentance of Offa II (died 796) for the murder of Æthelbert, king of the East Anglians.[2] If the children are unimportant in the twelfth-century story except in this connection, it is unlikely that they were prominent in the eighth-century form of the saga. Moreover, this touch, of which such skilful use was made by Chaucer, may well have appealed less to the Anglo-Saxon poet, who was directing all his energies to making the relationship between the wife and the husband vivid, and confining himself to the compass of a brief lyric.

Again, the interpretation of the phrase *folgað sēcan* in relation to the saga is not clear. Possibly the lyric adds a touch not in the *Vita*. The meaning sometimes adopted, that the lady sought her lord or his body of followers, receives a little support from the statement in the *Vita* that he departed "cum Equitum numerosa multitudine." But Schücking's rendering of the phrase, "to seek service," is probably the right one. In various versions of the tale the wife does the work of a servant at different stages of her career. Miss Rickert seems to regard *feran gewāt* as referring to the banishment of ll. 15 and 27, but these particularize the punishment; she must dwell in a cave in the forest—a very different thing from any meaning to be read into *folgað sēcan*. Perhaps we are to take the situation to be that, driven from home by the hostility of her husband's kin, she returned to

[1] *Grundriss*, *loc. cit.*

[2] Cf. Hunt, *History of the English Church from Its Foundation to the Norman Conquest*, p. 235.

an occupation similar to that before her marriage. The wicked relatives, not content with this, then ordered her banishment to the wood. The question is difficult of solution, but the discrepancy does not seem a serious one.

Taking due account of these resemblances and differences, it is difficult to sum up the question with absolute impartiality. The Offa-saga certainly explains most readily the puzzling situation in the lyric. Schücking asks, for example: "Wie sollte der mann, der gatte, den v. 47 ff. selbst in der bedrängtesten lage im fremden lande zeigen, der frau befehlen können, im wald zu leben?" If one tries to answer this from the evidence of the lines alone, one struggles about in a maze of blind conjecture. The saga makes the solution plain at once. Yet in the absence of the confirming evidence of proper names, a matter which Miss Rickert has discussed at length, it is impossible to speak with confidence of the connection which the resemblances of incident lead one to assume between the two. Operations with saga-material are always dangerous. But the general proposition that the true elucidation of the poem will come from a heroic tale nevertheless remains sound. It must be conceded that some such story as this is far more likely to form the basis of the lyric than an imaginary train of events concocted in the brain of some modern critic. Invention was rare in early times; poets were not given to originating their plots when there were such ample stores from which to borrow. Their preference was ever for reshaping a twice-told tale, giving it freshness by new touches added here and there. All this is really too familiar to call for repetition, although one of the most dangerous pitfalls into which the critic stumbles is forgetfulness of the literary methods of early times. Whatever may be thought of the Offa-saga as a parallel, then, there remain the best of reasons for believing that the lyric is founded upon material of the same general character.

Finally, if we may trust the evidence of the old tale, it is pleasant to think that this Anglo-Saxon Mariana finds happiness in the end, like her later sister in the moated grange.

WILLIAM WITHERLE LAWRENCE

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

THE PLÉIADE AND PLATONISM

In the course of a study of Ronsard in his volume on *Le seizième siècle*, M. Faguet, speaking of the leader of the Pléiade, remarks:

> Il faut d'abord lui savoir gré de n'avoir pas pris dans Pétrarque et d'avoir laissé aux Heroët et aux Maurice Scève la métaphysique amoureuse, l' idée cent fois exprimée, et toujours d'une façon plus raffinée, qu'un grand amour est une vertu, épure l'âme et l'élève jusqu'au domaine sacré des idées pures. Cette conception très féconde en galimatias est à peu près étrangère à Ronsard.

While he does not here distinguish between the "metaphysique amoureuse" of Petrarch and Heroët, what M. Faguet observes is in general quite correct. With the exception of but a few passages, platonism—that doctrine of a spiritual love of woman which had been the inspiration and theme of much of the best of French literature during the ten years preceding 1550—becomes suddenly almost non-existent in the bulky work of Ronsard.

It is the intention of the following paper to inquire from an examination of the French writings of the members of the Pléiade group in how far M. Faguet's remark concerning the relation of Ronsard to platonism is generally applicable to the seven literary men whose leader Ronsard confessedly was.

It is very striking how abrupt is the transition. From 1540–50 platonism was the dominant note of serious French poetry. Its discussion precipitated the famous "Querelle des Femmes" into which Rabelais himself was drawn.[1] The gay Marot chattered—not comprehending—about his *alliance de pensée*.[2] Platonism was the subject nearest to the heart of the greatest woman of her time—Margaret of Navarre—to whom Ronsard could pay such

[1] Cf. Abel Lefranc, "Le Tiers Livre de Pantagruel et la Querelle des Femmes," *Rev. des Etudes Rab.*, II, Nos. 1 and 2.

[2] Clément Marot, *Œuvres*, ed. Saint-Marc, Vol. I, Rondeau XXXVIII, p. 331, Rondeau LI, p. 338, and Vol. II, p. 32, Epigramme LXXXVI.

magnificent personal homage,[1] but from whose favorite and deepest beliefs regarding the power of intellectual love he evidently dissented. Though the "Prince of Poets" looked for a regeneration of French literature through a conscious assimilation and imitation of classical—and especially Greek—originals, and while Plato was constantly in his hands,[2] Ronsard could not see his way to an acceptance of Renaissance platonism, based though the latter claimed to be on the express teachings of Plato himself.

Though guilty of a great many petrarchan sonnets himself, it was possibly the interminably puny and futile vaporings of the petrarchists which disgusted the full-blooded Ronsard with platonism. For while the apostles of platonism sharply distinguished their theory from that of petrarchism,[3] Ronsard apparently did not; and in the twentieth of his *Sonnets pour Hélène*, fired by a love of the truth and sacredness of love, he sarcastically speaks of the caricature of love which he found at court:

Où peu de feu se trouve et beaucoup de fumée.[4]

Ronsard in fact only occasionally essays platonism, and as Longnon observes,[5] though Ronsard does sometimes try to strike the transcendental note, he cannot hold it long. His most successful sonnet of this kind is probably the fine No. CLXVII of the first book of the *Amours:*

Je veux brusler, pour m'en-voler aux Cieux,
Tout l'imparfait de ceste escorce humaine,
M'éternisant comme le fils d'Alcmeine,
Qui tout en feu s'assit entre les Dieux.
Ja mon esprit, chatouillé de son mieux,
Dedans ma chair rebelle se promeine,
Et ja le bois de sa victime ameine
Pour s'enflammer aux rayons de tes yeux.
O saint brasier! ô feu chastement beau!
Las! brule moi d'un si chaste flambeau,
Qu' abandonnant ma depouille connue,

[1] Cf. *Œuvres de Ronsard*, ed. Blanchemain, 8 vols., Paris, 1857–67, "Hymne Triomphal," Vol. II, pp. 313 ff., and "Eclogue VI," Vol. IV, pp. 115 ff.

[2] *Œuvres*, Vol. I, p. 362.

[3] Antoine Heroët, *La Parfaite Amye*, ed. Dolet, Lyons, 1543, p. 58.

[4] *Œuvres*, Vol. I, p. 293.

[5] H. Longnon, "La Cassandre de Ronsard," *Revue des Questions Historiques*, New Series, Vol. XXVII, pp. 224 ff.

Net, libre et nud, je vole d'un plein saut
Jusques au Ciel, pour adorer là haut
L'autre beauté dont la tienne est venue![1]

With this may be compared another sonnet, No. LIII of the *Sonnets pour Hélène*,[2] which is almost pure platonism as the Renaissance understood it. It contains, moreover, acknowledgment of woman's power for good over man, which the great Italian platonists and their French followers had possibly hoped to develop into a social gospel—the regeneration of man through spiritual communion with a refined, beautiful, and intellectual woman.[3]

Sometimes it appears that the lady whom Ronsard had in mind when he was writing would have liked to look on their relationship as platonic, but the poet proves a most unwilling pupil. For instance, in Sonnet XXVIII of those addressed to Hélène de Surgères, the heroine of the love-affair of his old age, Ronsard says:

Vous dites que l'amour entretient ses accords
Par l'esprit seulement; je ne saurois le croire:
Car l'esprit ne sent rien que par l'ayde du corps.[4]

The same idea is repeated in Sonnet L, in which the poet admits the influence of Plato on the spirit, but argues, as before, that without the body the spirit would be useless:

Or vous aimez l'esprit, et, sans discretion,
Vous dites que des corps les amours sont pollues.
Tel dire n'est sinon qu' imagination
Qui embrasse le faux pour les choses cognues;
Et c'est renouveler la fable d' Ixion
Qui se passoit de vent et n'aimoit que les nues.[5]

One of the earlier sonnets for Astrée—No. XV—contains the same hint: the possible preference of Ronsard's lady for his intellectual homage and at the same time the poet's implied contempt,

[1] *Œuvres*, Vol. I, p. 96. [2] *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 310.

[3] In this connection cf. Antoine Heroët, *La Parfaite Amye*, ed. 1543, p. 39; Marguerite de Navarre, *Les Adieux: Dernières Poésies*, ed. Lefranc, Paris, 1896, p. 352; cf. also W. A. R. Kerr, "Antoine Heroët's *Parfaite Amye*," *Publications of the Modern Language Association*, Vol. XX, p. 580, and note 1.

[4] *Œuvres*, Vol. I, p. 298. [5] *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 308.

or at least distaste, for the platonic atmosphere in which Mlle. d'Estrées seemingly wished to bloom:

> Voilà les poincts qui gardent l'amitié,
> Et non pas vous, qui n'aimez qu'en idées.[1]

Elsewhere, moreover, Ronsard speaks sarcastically of the *amour fabuleux*, which the ladies, he states, were learning from Léon Hébreu:

> Leon Hebrieu qui donne aux dames cognoissance
> D'un amour fabuleux, etc.[2]

In the closing lines of the sonnet, which is addressed to Hélène de Surgères, Ronsard expresses the coarsest kind of incredulity regarding the good faith of the Jewish platonist.

In 1573, when presenting to Charles IX a copy of Léon Hébreu, Ronsard distinguishes between the earthly love, which he had always understood, and the heavenly love which roused his contempt. The laureate counsels the king to choose the terrestrial Venus and leave the celestial to the gods:

> Prenez l'amour qui règne en terre
> Et laissez l'autre pour les dieux.[3]

This advice accords with the sentiment contained in what is perhaps the best known of all Ronsard's poems—the exquisite "Mignonne, allons voir si la rose." The closing three lines of this little ode—instinct as it is with the pagan, pleasure-loving spirit of the Renaissance—express, doubtless, Ronsard's true attitude toward the love problem:

> Cueillez, cueillez vostre jeunesse:
> Comme à cette fleur, la vieillesse
> Fera ternir vostre beauté.[4]

The attitude of Du Bellay is more sympathetic toward platonism than that of Ronsard. The doctrine of spiritual love, for a time at least, evidently deeply interested the poet; yet in the end Du Bellay also reacted against the transcendental, and his view of the tender passion became quite "natural."

[1] *Œuvres*, Vol. I, p. 274. [2] Pièces retranchées, LXII, Vol. I, p. 419.

[3] Ode VII, Book V, *Œuvres*, Vol. II, p. 331.

[4] Ode XVII, Book I, *Œuvres*, Vol. II, p. 117; cf. also the beautiful No. XLII of the *Sonnets pour Hélène*, *Œuvres*, Vol. I, p. 340.

The earliest verse published by Du Bellay is the sonnet group *L' Olive*, printed in 1549—the year which produced the *Défense et Illustration*. The best sonnet of the collection[1] is a fine piece of pure platonism, so well known as scarcely to justify quotation:

Si nostre vie est moins qu'une journée
En l'éternel, si l'an qui fait le tour
Chasse nos jours sans espoir de retour,
Si perissable est toute chose née,

Que songes-tu, mon ame emprisonnée?
Pourquoi te plais l'obscur de nostre jour
Si pour voler en un plus clair sejour
Tu as au dos l'aile bien empennée?

Là est le bien que tout esprit desire,
Là le repos où tout le monde aspire,
Là est l'amour, là le plaisir encore.

Là, ô mon ame, au plus haut ciel guidée
Tu y pourras recognoistre l'Idée
De la beauté qu'en ce monde j'adore.[2]

Although Du Bellay alludes to Heroët as more of a philosopher than a poet in the *Défense*, among the former's earliest work is a fine tribute in verse to the then celebrated author of *La Parfaite Amye*, which of course is platonism in its most quintessential form. From the complimentary way in which he refers, not only to Heroët's manner but also to his matter, it is easy to understand —in spite of his *Défense*—how far Du Bellay at first was from being revolutionary:

A HEROËT

Paris, mais bien la France toute,
De Seine oit tous les jours le son
Qui fait de toy mainte chanson
Que nostre siecle heureux escoute.

Heroët, aux vers heroïques
(Sujet vraiment digne du ciel),
Qui en douceur passent le miel,
En gravité les fronts stoïques,

[1] As Du Bellay assumes responsibility for the "Olive" sequence, the question of his sources is not important here. Cf., however, in this connection, Joseph Vianey, "Sources italiennes de l'Olive," *Annales Internationales d'Histoire*, 1901, Vol. VI, pp. 71-104.

[2] *Œuvres de J. Du Bellay*, ed. Marty-Laveaux, 2 vols., Paris, 1866-67, Vol. I, p. 137.

Ta muse, des Graces amie,
La mienne à te louer semond,
Qui sur le haut du double mont
As erigé l'Académie.[1]

The volume published by Du Bellay in 1552 shows that the influence of the platonizing school on the poet was now at its height. Among the poems is a graceful sonnet to Maurice Scève, in which the Lyons platonist, who, like Heroët, had been censured in the *Défense*, is compared to Petrarch and referred to as "sainctement inspiré." Scève's difficult series of dizains—*Délie*[2]—was published in 1544, just two years later than *La Parfaite Amye.*

From the point of view of platonism, however, the volume of 1552 has something much more important than the tribute to Scève, which in itself would be comparatively insignificant. The *Sonnets de l'Honneste Amour* are to a considerable extent impregnated with platonist theories. It is impossible, for instance, to mistake the source of the following sonnet—No. II of the series:

Ce ne sont pas ces beaux cheveux dorez,
Ni ce beau front, qui l'honneur mesme honore:
Ce ne sont pas les deux archers encore
De ses beaux yeux de cent yeux adorez;

Ce ne sont pas les deux brins colorez
De ce coral, ces levres que j'adore;
Ce n'est ce teint emprunté de l'aurore
Ni autre objet des cœurs enamourez;

Ce ne sont pas ni ces lis ni ces roses,
Ni ces deux rangs de perles bien closes;
C'est cest esprit, rare present des cieux,

Dont la beaulté de cent graces pourveue
Perce mon ame et mon cœur et mes yeux
Par les rayons de sa poignante veue.[3]

[1] *Œuvres*, Vol. I, p. 259. This is only one of several graceful allusions to Heroët by Du Bellay.

[2] *Délie*, as has often been pointed out, is an anagram of "L'idée." Cf. in this connection, Drayton's sonnet sequence *Idea*, and Daniels' *Delia* (both of 1594).

[3] *Œuvres*, Vol. II, p. 61.

Again the close of the fourth sonnet of this sequence connects Du Bellay at once with platonic doctrine and especially with Heroët's phrasing of it:

Le premier feu de mon moindre plaizir
Faict halleter mon alteré dezir:
Puis de noz cœurs la celeste Androgyne
Plus sainctement vous oblige ma foy:
Car j'ayme tant cela que j'ymagine
Que je ne puis aymer ce que je voy.[1]

Although he was afterward to react against the "quintessential" in love, at this period Du Bellay seems to preach that idea as the climax of the aspiration of his affection:

Ces deux soleilz, deux flambeaux de mon âme,
Pour me rejoindre à la divinité,
Percent l'obscur de mon humanité
Par les rayons de leur jumelle flâme.
O cent fois donq, et cent fois bienheureux
L' heureux aspect de mon astre amoureux!
Puisque le ciel voulut à ma naissance
Du plus divin de mes affections
Par l'allambic de voz perfections
Tirer d'Amour une cinquième essence.[2]

The *tiers ciel* also, to which Du Bellay alludes in Sonnet VI of this same sequence, was later on to be derided by the poet as being merely a pose:

Quand je suis pres de la flamme divine,
Où le flambeau d'amour est allumé
Mon sainct dezir sainctement emplumé
Jusqu'au tiers ciel d'un prin-vol m'achemine.[3]

The practical identification, too, of beauty with goodness, or at least a belief in the incompatibility of beauty and evil, so prevalent among the Renaissance platonists, appears in the seventh sonnet:

Le dieu bandé a desbandé mes yeux,
Pour contempler cette beaulté cachée
Qui ne se peut, tant soit bien recherchée
Representer en ung cœur vicieux.[4]

[1] *Œuvres*, Vol. II, p. 62. The copy of the Dolet edition of the *Parfaite Amye*, possessed by the Bibliothèque Nationale, contains bound in with it a translation by Heroët into French of the *Androgyne de Platon*.

[2] *Œuvres*, Vol. II, p. 62, Sonnet V. [3] *Ibid.*, p. 63. [4] *Ibid.*

Speaking of the ecstasy into which this transcendental love throws him, Du Bellay says in Sonnet X:

Ja mon esprit, ja mon cœur, ja ma vois,
Ja mon amour conçoit forme nouvelle
D'une beaulté plus parfaictement belle
Que le fin or epuré par sept fois.
Rien de mortel ma langue plus ne sonne:
Ja peu à peu moi-mesme j'abandonne, etc.[1]

In Du Bellay's subsequent work platonism seems to lose the reality which the foregoing citations may indicate the doctrine of spiritual love once had for him. At any rate the poet reacts markedly from the mental attitude which finds expression in the *Honneste Amour* group of sonnets. The *Zeitgeist* appears to have been against platonism; possibly, too, Du Bellay's affair with Faustine in Rome in 1555 did not tend to make him regard such conceptions with sympathetic interest. His later mood, which is quite in harmony with that of his friend Ronsard, voices itself in the poem, "Contre les Pétrarquistes,"[2] contained in the *Jeux Rustiques*, published in 1558:

J'ai oublié l'art de pétrarquiser,
Je veux d'amour franchement deviser,
Sans vous flatter et sans me déguiser.

In the sixth stanza of this interesting poem Du Bellay comes out flatly against that "quintessential" in love and that "third heaven" which a few years before, as we have seen, had been his aspiration:

Quelque autre encor' la terre dedaignant
Va du tiers ciel les secrets enseignant,
Et de l'amour, où il va se baignant,
Tire une quinte essence.
Mais quant à moy, qui plus terrestre suis
Et n'ayme rien que ce qu'aymer je puis,[3]
Le plus subtil qu'en amour je poursuis
S'appelle jouissance.

[1] *Œuvres*, Vol. II, p. 65. References to this rapt ecstasy in which contemplation of the beloved object might end are to be found elsewhere in the literature of the Renaissance. Cf. Heroët *Parfaite Amye*, p. 25; cf. also Baldassare Castiglione, *Il Cortegiano*, close of Book IV.

[2] *Œuvres*, Vol. II, p. 333. For some remarks on this poem cf. Arthur Tilley, *Literature of the French Renaissance*, Vol. I, pp. 348, 349.

[3] There could hardly be a more thoroughly right-about face than is evidenced by a comparison of these lines with a couplet already quoted from the fourth sonnet of the *Honneste Amour* series:

Car j'ayme tant cela que j'ymagine
Que je ne puis aymer ce que je voy.

Du Bellay's reaction against petrarchism may be compared with an interesting passage in the *Parfaite Amye* in which Heroët also scornfully repudiates petrarchism and carefully distinguishes his very serious and philosophic conception of platonic love from that of Petrarch and his imitators.[1] Du Bellay, it is clear, either did not see or did not understand, or if he knew of, did not accept the distinction which Heroët had tried to set up sixteen years before. This one fact shows very plainly what platonism had lost in its fall from philosophy to fashion. Platonism, as it was understood by Michelangelo, by Vittoria Colonna, by Heroët, and by Margaret of Navarre, had early interested Du Bellay, but as he grew older, its petrarchistic poor relation, from which he gives no sign of distinguishing it, only aroused his contempt.

The closing stanzas of *Contre les Pétrarquistes* betray how entirely "natural" his conception of love had become, and yet as in the case of Ronsard, Du Bellay also met among the fair sex a reluctance to give up that transcendental homage to which the women of the Renaissance had grown accustomed:

De vos beautez je diray seulement
Que, si mon œil ne juge folement
Vostre beauté est joincte esgalement
  A vostre bonne grace,
De mon amour, que mon affection,
Est arrivée à la perfection
De ce qu'on peult avoir de passion
  Pour une belle face.

Si toutefois Petrarque vous plaist mieux,
Je reprendray mon chant melodieux,
Et voleray, jusqu'au sejour des dieux
  D'une aile mieux guidée:
Là dans le sein de leurs divinitez,
Je choisiray cent mile nouveautez
Dont je peindray vos plus grandes beautez
  Sur la plus belle Idée.[2]

[1] Heroët, *Parfaite Amye*, p. 58.

[2] A similar mood will be found expressed in the poem, "Du temps que j'étois amoureux," addressed to Olivier de Magny (*Œuvres*, Vol. II, p. 327); and also in the "Elégie d'Amour" (*Œuvres*, Vol. II, p. 339).

The first book of the *Erreurs Amoureuses* of Pontus de Thyard was published in 1549. It opens with an introductory sonnet to Scève, which shows that Pontus shared the early admiration of Du Bellay for the platonizing poet of Lyons. "*Disgrace*,"[1] in which Pontus discourses on "Idée" is quite obscure enough for Scève; it begins thus:

La haulte Idée à mon univers mere,
Si haultement de nul jamais comprise,
M'est à present tenebreuse Chimere.

The general mood of these sonnets is the stereotyped heat and cold of conventional petrarchism, though Sonnet XLIV of Book I seems to indicate that the drift of Pontus' wooing, like that of Petrarch himself, was not entirely idealistic:

Ami (dit-elle, en visage amoureux)
Je mettray fin à tes jours langoureux,
Pour commencer tes bien-heureuses nuits.

But it would appear from other sonnets of the sequence that the promises of his lady remained unfulfilled. Pontus, like Petrarch, was forced into a purity of act, if not of thought. However, by the close of the first book he is so far converted to the intellectual view of love that he is able to pen a fairly convincing poem, "De Chaste Amour," toward the end of which a few lines run as follows:

Noz deux esprits d'une complexion,
Sont eslongnez de toute passion,
Passion qui tourmente:
Vivans ainsi en ce mortel sejour
Avec espoir, qu'au ciel leur grande amour
Sera du tout contente.

The second book of the *Erreurs* appeared in 1550. Sonnet XII in its opening verses shows marked traces of the influence of platonism:

De quelle Idée ay-je peu retirer
Le haut dessein de ma conception?
Comme c'est peu toute perfection
En un pourtraict, si vivement tirer?

[1] *Œuvres de Pontus de Thyard*, ed. Marty-Laveaux, Paris, 1875, p. 19.

In 1551 Pontus de Thyard, whom his subtilizing on love clearly interested, became evidently quite engrossed in the serious platonism which had preoccupied the immediate precursors of the school of Ronsard. For in this year he published a French translation of the *Dialoghi di Amore* of Léon Hébreu of whom mention has already been made in connection with Ronsard. This translation was not signed with Pontus' own name, but with his device, "Amour Immortelle."

Book III of the *Erreurs* appeared in 1554. In this third installment Pontus, though now a considerable dignitary in the church—an apostolic prothonotary—shows a tendency to leave behind him his platonic attitude. As Sainte-Beuve humorously remarks, the poet "avait abjuré ses erreurs de jeunesse pour l'évêché de Chalons."[1] Like Du Bellay, Pontus was becoming "natural." Sonnets I and XI are good evidence of this fact.

The platonic "Idea" reappears, however, in the fine, dignified fourth sonnet:

Père divin, sapience eternelle,
Commencement et fin de toute chose,
Où en pourtrait indeleble repose
De l'Univers, l'Idée universelle:

Voy de tes Raiz la plus belle estincelle
Qui soit çà bas en corps humain enclose,
Que la trop fiere impeteuse Parque ose
Tirer du clos de sa cendre mortelle, etc.

In Sonnet VII Pontus speaks of his lady's spirit, which, he says, has come down from fairest heaven:

Du plus beau Ciel, ton esprit descendu, etc.

The concluding sonnet (No. XXXIII) of the third book of the *Erreurs* is distinctly platonic in tone. Perhaps it is not strange that the final note struck should be idealistic. The opening quatrain runs thus:

Mon esprit ha heureusement porté
Au plus beau ciel sa force outrecuidée
Pour s'abbreuver en la plus belle Idée
D'où le pourtrait j'ai pris de ta beauté, etc.

[1] Sainte-Beuve, *Tableau de la Poésie Française et du Théâtre Français au XVIme Siècle*, Paris, 1886, p. 92.

Le Livre des Vers Liriques was published in 1555. In the course of the poem "En Faveur de Quelques Excellens Poetes de ce Temps," Pontus makes flattering reference to Scève and Heroët. Alluding to the latter he writes:

> Voyez encores l'Amour
> Qui heroiquement parle
> Souz Heroët, etc.[1]

The *Recueil des Nouvelles Œuvres Poétiques*, published in 1573 in connection with a general reimpression of Pontus' poetic work, contains an interesting piece of verse: "Elégie pour une dame, enamourée d'une autre dame."[2] The love of man for man is admitted to have been fairly common, and Pontus mentions a few historical examples. Perhaps the Renaissance was not without cases of its own of which Pontus could have spoken had he cared. Probably the friendship of Shakspere and the young patron to whom the *Sonnets* are addressed will occur to one's mind.

The love, however, of a woman for a woman Pontus feels to be a much rarer thing and worthy of note. In the poet's phrasing of her feelings the lady protests:

> Car jamais purité ne fust plus grande au Ciel,
> Plus grande ardeur au feu, plus grande douceur au miel,
> Plus grande bonté ne fust au reste de nature
> Qu'en mon cueur, où l'Amour a pris sa nourriture, etc.[3]

The work of Pontus de Thyard may be said, I think, to have been to a considerable extent touched by the influence of platonism. As in Du Bellay we meet tributes to Scève and Heroët. Thyard's reference to the case of love between members of the same sex is also to be noted. While he gives no evidence of distinguishing between petrarchism and platonism, yet a certain amount of his verse, together with his translation of Léon Hébreu, testifies beyond question to his several years' interest in platonizing theories.

[1] *Œuvres*, p. 121. [2] *Ibid.*, pp. 191 ff. [3] *Ibid.*, p. 193.

The love poetry of Remy Belleau[1] is distinctly of two sorts: the conventional tone of the ordinary neo-petrarchistic sonnet, or else a note of frank "natural" voluptuousness.[2]

Belleau, it is to be remarked, did not begin to publish till 1556, by which time Du Bellay had reacted against platonism and Pontus de Thyard had ceased production. It is therefore not surprising to find scarcely any traces of platonism in his work. Perhaps a faint glimmer of the now unfashionable attitude may be discovered in the little poem "Dialogue," in which Amour explains to the passer-by who he is:

> Passant, je ne suis nay de la folle Cypris
> Ny du fangeux Plaisir le neveu point ne suis,
> J'allume à la vertu les ames plus modestes
> Pour les guider au ciel dans les troupes celestes.

In the two volumes of Belleau's work there is a vast amount of love-reference, but it is all in the one strain—pure convention, or a quite "natural" delight in rolling under his tongue morsels of sensuous beauty.

It may, therefore, be said that platonism—at least in its serious, non-petrarchistic form—is practically absent from the work of Belleau.

The love poetry of De Baïf,[3] whether dedicated to the fictitious lady Meline,[4] to the flesh-and-blood woman he calls Francine, or as found in the *Amours Diverses*, is composed in the strict petrarchan phraseology, and so far as the serious platonism of the decade of 1540–50 is concerned, is for the purposes of this paper of little but of a negative value.

The most significant mood of Jodelle[5] in his attitude toward the love-theorizing of his time is his tendency toward reaction.

[1] *Œuvres*, ed. Marty-Laveaux, 2 vols., Paris, 1878.

[2] Examples of the former are innumerable. Cf. "Complainte du feu d'amour," Vol. I, p. 88; "Sonnet," Vol. I, p. 91; "À sa Maistresse," Vol. I, p. 117, etc. Examples of Belleau's frankly sensuous—sometimes even sensual—attitude are also frequent; cf. "La Nuict," Vol. I, pp. 120 ff.

[3] *Œuvres*. ed. Marty-Laveaux, 5 vols., Paris, 1871–90. If the author puts forward the work as his own, his sources, in a quest like the present, are not important. Cf., however, in this connection, E. S. Ingraham, *Sources of Les Amours de Jean Antoine de Baïf*, 1905.

[4] *Œuvres*, Vol. I, p. 195.

[5] *Œuvres*, ed. Marty-Laveaux, 2 vols., Paris, 1870.

He mistrusts the love which has only "la vertu pour son but et son pris," and he looks on marriage as the happiest outcome of love:

Recherche qui voudra cet Amour qui domine,
Comme l'on dict, les Dieux, les hommes, les esprits,
Qu'on feint le premier né des Dieux, et qui a pris
Eternellement soing de ceste grande machine:
Dont l'arc, le trait, la trousse, et la torche divine
N'a rien que la vertu pour son but et son pris,
Sans passions, douleurs, remords, larmes et cris:
Quant à moy je croiray que tel on l'imagine,
Et qu'au monde il n'est point: quant aux faulses amorces,
De l'autre aveugle Amour j'en despite les forces.
Mais je croy si Amour avenu nous vient des Cieux,
C'est lors que deux moitiez par marriage unies
Quittent pour l'amour vray, dont se paissent leur vie,
Tout amour fantastique, et tout amour sans yeux.[1]

Surely it is clear that this sonnet contains a condemnation of both the platonic and petrarchistic variety of love; and the advocacy of marital love ranges Jodelle as entirely out of sympathy with the doctrines in which his fellow-members of the Pléiade, Du Bellay and Pontus de Thyard, had been for a time so interested.

Reaction against the conventional petrarchan mood is indeed frequent in Jodelle, and he even occasionally, in the style of Berni, burlesques the cut-and-dried sonnet addressed to the Laura of the sixteenth century.[2] Generally speaking, therefore, it may be said that Jodelle has no sympathy for the love theories so current in French literature from 1540 to 1550.

The work of Dorat,[3] the senior member of the Pléiade, is almost entirely of an occasional character, and from the point of view of this study is insignificant. He may therefore be dismissed with bare mention.

[1] Sonnet XXXIII, Vol. II.

[2] *Œuvres*, Vol. II; *Amours*, Sonnets XXXVII, XLI, XLIII, and Appendix, p. 340. Other proofs of the emancipation of Jodelle from the influence of any transcendentalism with respect to ideas regarding love may be noticed in his poems entitled: "*Chapitre d'Amour*," *Œuvres*, Vol. II, pp. 25 ff.

[3] *Œuvres*, ed. Marty-Laveaux, Paris, 1875.

The general result of this review of the work of the Pléiade—in so far as that work is concerned with the subject of platonism—seems to indicate, though all the members of that famous literary group—disregarding the negligible Dorat—dealt largely in petrarchism, that, apart from Du Bellay and Thyard, platonism had but little influence on them. Ronsard, Belleau, De Baïf, and Jodelle are practically antipathetic to the transcendental love creed of a Castiglione or a Heroët.

As regards Du Bellay and Pontus de Thyard, it is evident that early in their poetical careers both were strongly under the influence of Heroët and Scève and considerably interested, especially about the years 1551 and 1552, in platonist ideas. Du Bellay, as we have seen, however, soon consciously and deliberately turned his back on platonism, and Pontus de Thyard early ceased to write. The momentum, therefore, of the intellectual movement initiated by the group, of which Margaret of Navarre had been the center, rapidly spent itself.

It is clear, however, that the members of Pléiade were in some respects not so revolutionary as is sometimes thought, and that indeed the literature they produced, though it flowered finely, was rooted to a considerable extent in that which immediately antedated it, and which the new school had officially condemned. It is worthy of note also that several of the gems of Pléiade verse owe their inspiration to the lofty conception of platonism—the theme par-excellence of the almost forgotten poetry which immediately preceded the work of Ronsard and his friends.

W. A. R. KERR

ADELPHI COLLEGE

MEDIAEVAL LATIN LYRICS[1]

PART I

Some five years ago I was industriously following the traces of German popular poetry whithersoever they led. With the customary guidebooks at hand to direct the journey, I walked the broad road that sweeps almost uninterruptedly from the lyrics of Heine, Eichendorff, and Uhland back through the *volkslieder* and *meisterlieder* of Reformation Germany to the earliest springtime of *minnesang*. But suddenly the trail which in its last stage had been growing somewhat indistinct vanished quite from view; strain my eyes as I might, I could yet find no further evidences of lyric production in Germany as I looked on backward to younger times—to the empire of the Ottos and of Charles the Great. It was as if some traveler had wandered musing to the edge of an emerald oasis, to be rudely awakened from his reverie by beholding the brown silence of the desert. A moment before all the forest-birds had been piping from their leafy nests, but now

> Kein Vogel singt auf meinem Pfad,
> Ob meinem Haupte rauscht kein Blatt.

Turn back I would not—but how to go ahead? For some while all landmarks seemed to be lacking, and much time was lost in groping here and there in search of tangible beginnings. I soon had read all the theoretical expositions so conveniently listed by Schönbach[2]—theories that the German lyric had extraneous origins of various sorts, and that if one wished to learn of it before the year 1150 one must go far afield: either to France with Gaston Paris and Jeanroy, to Araby with Courthope,[3] or to the

[1] This paper was first presented to the English Club of Princeton University in February, 1907.

[2] In his *Anfänge des deutschen Minnesangs* (1898).

[3] Professor Burdach has announced a study, "Über den Ursprung des mittelalterlichen höfischen Minnesangs, Liebesromans und Frauendienstes," *Sitzungsber. d. k. preussischen Akad.*, Vol. XXVIII (1904), p. 933. He says: "The position of the lyrical court-poet and the conventional concept of love in the courtly literature of the twelfth century are a novelty which, although it does appear in the form of a fixed literary design, may yet not be derived from the earlier poetry of France and Germany, or from older tradition. The possibility is presented that Arabian court-poetry with its erotically colored panegyric in honor of ruling or highly placed women was a fruitful source of influence, together with the oriental romantic love-story."

early mediaeval churches and schools which finally achieved a graceful kind of profane Latin song by imitating the sacred songs or the classics. Most of all I was interested in the contention of Ernst Martin that a popularizing Latin *minnesang* had preceded its German model, but I hesitated to accept this thesis for two reasons: first, I did not believe Martin proved his point from the slender evidence of the Benedictbeuern MS alone —at least his proof could be made to read two ways;[1] secondly, it seemed strange that a Latin vessel should be the *ampulla* which held the baptismal oil of German lyric singing. I then believed, too, with Scherer that the Latin dress of a song effectually hid all traces of its immediate origin, and so would always reason: Why try to win mediaeval Latin lyrics for Germany as a popular and native expression, if we may never pierce the mystery of their birthplace? *Cui bono?*

Thus I came ever back to my starting-point at the edge of the desert. And there might I have remained, but for a certain doggedness of purpose[2] and for Wilhelm Meyer. I may say that the *Fragmenta burana* and his other writings on mediaeval rhythms have harmed rather than helped on many occasions, for keen and deep as they without exception are, they often lead one off into strange fields of speculation and of subjective reasoning. But this one thing they taught me: From the Latin poems of the Dark Ages and early Middle Ages we may derive a continuous story of lyric writing and singing by Germans in Germany. With Grimm

[1] For a history *ab ovo* of the discussion about the Latin and German songs in this MS, cf. Lundius "Deutsche Vagantenlieder in den Carmina burana," *Zeitschr. f. deut. Phil.*, Vol. XXXIX (1907), pp. 330 ff. Lundius gives a convenient bibliography of this hundred years' strife among scholars, begun in 1807 by Docen.

[2] Because I could not forget Müllenhoff's compelling words when speaking of the *liebesgruss* of *Ruodlieb* (Müllenhoff-Scherer, *Denkmäler*[3], Vol. II, p. 154): "This love-greeting should and must find a place in this collection as the oldest example of German *minne*-poetry. The teaching of Wackernagel and of Wilmanns that such love-songs, nay that the whole German lyric did not appear until the twelfth century does not, it is true, need such confutation (cf. Burdach, *Zeitschr. f. deut. Alt.*, Vol. XXVII, p. 343; Meyer, *ibid.*, Vol. XXIX, p. 121; Berger, *Zeitschr. f. deut. Phil.*, Vol. XIX, p. 440). It is sufficiently confuted by the nature of man himself, and by the realization that all poetry dwells in the sensation of the moment and is originally but a surrendering to it. There are early examples in German poetry of prayers, complaints, imprecations, and songs of mock and praise; how then should expression of the mightiest and most poetic impulse of all have failed until the year 1150 or 1160? The only new thing at this time is that love-poetry crowds more undisguisedly and luxuriantly to utterance, that it appears in the foreground, and becomes a distinguishing mark of the new era."

therefore I could now believe that the German lyric was an indigenous product.

The process of reasoning which finally determined this new faith was simple. (1) I found no German lyrics in Germany before the year 1150. (2) There must be lyrics of some sort in Germany before this time, or we have to regard one of the richest and the most subjective native expressions of the modern world as calmly pilfered overnight from France or elsewhere.[1] (3) Latin lyrics were current in Germany long before the year 1150. (4) Many of these Latin lyrics are just the sort of thing which was later written in German by Germans.

Now that my creed was once clearly defined, I had no doubt but that I could find confirmation and development of it in books. I knew that there were histories of early mediaeval literature in Europe written from the general view-point as well as from that of specific nationality. These I proceeded to read, but soon discovered that however excellent they might prove for the student of some particular author or monument they failed without exception to achieve grouped pictures of different men in connection with the history of a movement, or of different movements in their relation to the history of a form, such as the evolution of the drama, of the lyric, etc. In other words, I found a series of doctor's dissertations, school-programmes, and monographs—or an encyclopedia—where I had hoped for a story of early mediaeval literature—nowhere a ten Brink or a Scherer.[2] It was as if Gröber had said: If you find that I have failed to gather a single particle of waste in the Augaean stables of mediaeval Latin writing, let my head be the forfeit. A wonderful *grundriss zur geschichte* this—like the work of Ebert and of Manitius—but we die while waiting for some poet interpreter of the Latin lyric of the Middle Ages. Of all men yet, perhaps Kögel has come

[1] Unless we believe that the lyric developed from an earlier undifferentiated poetry that was both lyric and epic. A discussion of this theory with complete bibliography pro and con may be found in R. M. Meyer, "Alte deutsche Volksliedchen," *Zeitschr. f. deut. Alt.*, Vol. XXIX (1885), pp. 122 ff.

[2] Ferdinand Wolf longed for a history of mediaeval Latin poetry as long ago as 1841; cf. his *Über die Lais, Sequenzen und Leiche*, p. 281. The first real attempt to meet this demand is the anonymous study on "Mediaeval Latin Poetry," *Christian Remembrancer*, Vol. LII (1866), pp. 351-92, Vol. LIII, pp. 1-36; an investigation, unfortunately, which is based upon slender material and an insufficient knowledge of the sources.

nearest to interpreting the material rightly, despite the slurs of Winterfeld.

Even though no Daniel had come to judgment in this cause, I hesitated long before writing a single sentence relative to mediaeval Latin poetry. Conscious of the wicked irony which sparkles in the phrase of Forcellini—*totius Latinitatis lexicon*—aware that I had rummaged often enough through the folios of Du Cange to find myself still sole arbiter of a lyric phrase, I contented myself with reading what others had done in the way of casual lightening of the burden imposed by poor texts and garbled diction, and where others were silent as to any one poem or set of poems, I occupied my time in doing what I might to penetrate the underbrush which so often hid the original meaning and form of such poetry. Thus I came to know specific works of Grimm and Du Méril and Wright, Pertz and Giesebrecht and Laistner, Dümmler and Wattenbach and Piper, Martin and Francke and Meyer, Traube and Hauréau and Gröber, Werner and Heyne and Winterfeld—to recite but a few of the scores whose names are not the least on the herald's list of scholarship in the field of mediaeval Latin poetry.

After examining this roster one might well believe that there was small reason for further writing on the subject of the lyric in the early Middle Ages; unless, that is, the new investigator would but stoop to pick up a seedling of knowledge left by some earlier gleaner in the fields of Boaz; unless he would fill at any cost—through some new and unimportant theory perhaps—the lean pages of his argument. Sensitive to the imputation of the last two sentences I have heretofore done nothing further in the way of public discussion than lay down tentative prolegomena such as those contained in a previous study on the origins of *minnesang*. But as time sped on and I found that others were neglecting that upon which I wished to insist—that others, often those whom I greatly respected, were preaching what was to me false doctrine—then I felt no longer bound to hold my peace. The field of the early mediaeval lyric may belong in a loose sense to the carefully trained scientist in classical forms, for it is all Latin. In another, and a truer, sense it may belong to the mediaevalist—for he

alone is cognizant of the multiplicity of tortuous meanings with which for some hundreds of years the mediaeval mind loved to encumber itself. But the mediaeval lyric belongs pre-eminently to the student of modern literary forms, for without a knowledge of it the modernist has an end without a beginning—he has the second term of an unintelligible ratio whose first term is x—he has the solution of some riddle that he has never heard.

It will be little strange if certain views arrived at below comport but ill with the findings of previous judges or juries. Any great expression which continues for centuries, as did the mediaeval Latin lyric, has, like some precious ruby, a hundred different facets. These catch and refract the light in myriad radiating arrows, depending upon the angle from which they are approached. My particular angle as stated at the outset is the one made by the German lyric and the Latin lyric at the point of their tangency. Of the former I can know nothing prior to *minnesang*, unless I treat of the latter. This knowledge is what has driven me to discuss, for purposes of my own, things about which I should otherwise never have come to speak.

POPULAR SONG AND SCHOOL POETRY

In the introductory words to his excellent study of Latin school poetry[1] Francke states that the school was the workshop where all mediaeval Latin poetry was made. For even the lyric, he says, the churchly and vagabond song, cannot be conceived of without the influence of such an environment.[2] To be sure, he continues, the lyric soon passed outside of the school and attained artistic forms all its own, in the service of and aided by worship and music. But on the other hand didactic and epic poetry were never able successfully to deny their original manner of coming into being.

I have only one quarrel with the foregoing statement—a statement which has often been repeated since—and that is that it

[1] *Zur Geschichte der lateinischen Schulpoesie des xii. und xiii. Jahrhunderts* (1879).

[2] Marold likewise says (*Zeitschr. f. deut. Phil.*, Vol. XXIII [1890], pp. 2 f.): "Church song and learned school-poetry form the real soil from which the poetry of the goliards sprang." But he further remarks: "In consequence of their association with the people and the popular minstrels in France and Germany quite a number of communal elements penetrated their songs and with this qualification Schmeller is entirely justified in saying (*Carmina burana*, p. viii): "With good reason we claim a considerable part of mediaeval Latin poetry as our native possession."

excludes, I feel sure, one constant source of much that was best in the mediaeval lyric: *popular song.* I believe, that is, that we *can* conceive of vagabond lyrics aside from the influence of either church or school. Not for a moment do I doubt the all-important influence which these environments exercised upon the profane and popular lyric. But it is one thing to assert that the mediaeval Latin erotic lyric owed much to the church-hymn, to the religious inserts in the service of the church,[1] to antiphon and part-song, to trope, cantio, motet, and sequence; it is one thing to claim for the school tasks and the schoolrooms of the Middle Ages a great influence in shaping the form and themes of profane song; it is quite another thing to assert that we should never have had a rhythmic profane verse except for the pre-existent ecclesiastical and scholastic model. Great as was the impulse which cadence, rhyme, and stanza-structure of the religious lyric and school-poem gave to erotic song, there was another thing which often possessed still stronger attraction for it; and this was the native popular dance-song and lyric ballad written or sung in the vernacular language.

There is no need for us to subscribe entirely to the doctrine that the mediaeval Latin lyric owed its very existence first to the liturgy and afterward to the schools. Tropes, motets, and sequences were doubtless a fertilizing source of much of the later beauty and diction of profane song; schools of grammar and rhetoric did create ten thousand custom-made lyrics and ballads for the consumption of the laity. But when Gautier[2] and Meyer[3] insist upon the creed that these were the only source, they are

[1] I have often wondered when face to face with the awe-inspiring confusion of early mediaeval liturgical MSS, how scholars could attain the simple clarity of their present theory that these inserts were the "bio-germ" of Latin profane singing. Such MSS were often written as prose, and at times none may decide where one verse ends and another begins; every sort of meter and rhythm is represented in them; some MSS were written chiefly to preserve different melodies, and in these we frequently do not know whether the accompanying text comprises all of a song or only a single stanza of it; the texts may be from several different centuries, and of every possible description—deeply religious and scabrous, side by side; it is not always possible to determine the age of a MS, the country in which it was written, the purpose it aimed to fulfil, or the audience to which it was addressed. Unintelligible gaps occur to tempt the reader to emendation: erasures have been made, but we know not why: the same text appears in variant forms and ascribed to many authors. How may we then hold so simple a creed as that laid down in the opening sentence of this note?

[2] *Histoire de la poésie liturgique au moyen âge*, Vol. I (1886).

[3] *Fragmenta burana* (1901).

setting forth an orthodoxy which requires from its adherents all faith, instead of all reason, for they may never conclusively prove their creed.

When Meyer, for instance, would adduce evidence that the sequence had won over profane poetry he cites the Cambridge songs of late tenth and early eleventh centuries.[1] From this group he reprints in sequence form the story of the "Snow-Child":

Advertite omnes populi ridiculum:
Et audite quomodo Suevum mulier et ipse illam defraudaret:
Constantiae civis Suevulus trans aequora:
Gazam portans navibus domi conjugem lascivam nimis relinquebat;

but he does not refer to the brusque five-syllabled verses of two narrative poems in the same MS: Alfrad and Heriger. The latter of these Jacob Grimm believed to be but the retelling in Latin verses of a German popular song on Archbishop Heriger (*floruit* 913–27). It is the droll tale of the man who ran off with a

[1] Traube once complained that Manitius did not understand Wilh. Meyer, but who may understand him at such a time as this? Now the story of the "Snow-Child" was famous among mediaeval entertainers and appears in many different forms (cf., for instance, Galfredus de Vinosalvo (*Poetria nova* vss. 724–28) Leyser, *G. de V. Ars poetica* (1724); Barbazon-Méon, *Fabliaux* (1808), Vol. III, p. 215; von der Hagen, *Gesammtabenteuer*, Vol. II, p. 383; *Anzeiger für Kunde der deutschen Vorzeit*, Vol. IV, p. 75; *Zeitschr. f. deut. Alt.*, Vols. XIV, p. 472; XIX, pp. 119 ff., 240; *Deut. Nat. Liter.*, Vol. CCXXI, pp. 217, 235: Ebert, *Überliefe-rungen zur Geschichte, Literatur und Kunst der Vor- und Mitwelt* (1826), Vol. I, Part 1, p. 80; Du Méril, *Poésies populaires latines* (1843), p. 275; *Poésies inédites* (1854), p. 418; *Rheinisches Museum*, Vol. III, p. 331; Müllenhoff-Scherer, *Denkmäler*, No. XXI (3d ed.); *Coventry Mysteries* [ed. Halliwell, Shakspere Society, Vol. II], pp. 140 f.; Cloetta, *Beiträge zur Litteraturgeschichte des Mittelalters*, Vol. I (1890), p. 106; *Fragmenta burana*, p. 174; Hauréau, *Notices et extraits*, Vol. XXIX, Part 2, pp. 240, 303; Winterfeld, *Stilfragen*, p. 40, etc., etc.). Several times, at least, it took the shape of an epigrammatic quatrain:

Dum vir abest, puerum parit ejus adultera conjux
Et reduci narrat, quod nive sit genitus.
Hunc apud Ethiopes vir vendit, et illa requirit;
De nive conceptum sol liquefecit, ait.

or again:

Conjux absente gravidata viro redeunte:
Nixit in ore meo, sum gravis, inquid eo.
Inde dolens multum puerum vir vendit adultum,
Et dixit; Niveum sol liquefecit eum.

Why not therefore say that the epigrammatic quatrain had "won over profane poetry" and make the former a stepping-stone in the evolution of the latter, without which it could not come to be? Posit, that is, an epigram before every lyric, as if the one was the root from which the other flowered. None may ever tell, of course, just what the first form was that so popular a theme took: whether prose or verse. And we must remember that we likewise cannot reason surely in the case of other poems which are represented by a single MS alone. Just because these are handed down to us in a form which shows the influence of clerical workmanship we need not, we must not, imagine that the theme of the poem sprang from the church or lived only in the form which some church-poet or school-poet gave it. We can with safety ascribe to such poets only a part interest in the poem, and not the very fatherhood of it.

piece of liver.[1] More important still, Meyer omits to mention a tender lyric from the same MS which has no more essential connection with the sequence than it has with the moon; the *Verna feminae suspiria:*

Levis exsurgit zephyrus
Et sol procedit tepidus;
Jam terra sinus aperit,
Dulcore suo diffluit.

Ver purpuratum exiit,
Ornatus suos induit;
Aspergit terram floribus,
Ligna silvarum frondibus.

Struunt lustra quadrupedes
Et dulces nidos volucres;
Inter ligna florentia
Sua decantant gaudia.

Quod oculis dum video
Et auribus dum audio,
Heü, pro tantis gaudiis
Tantis inflor suspiriis.

Cum mihi sola sedeo
Et haeo revolvens palleo,
Si forte caput sublevo,
Nec audio nec video.

Tu saltim, Veris gratia,
Exaudi et considera
Frondes, flores et gramina;
Nam mea languet anima.[2]

[1] Cf. Bobertag, *Vierhundert Schwänke des xvi. Jahrhunderts*, p. 258; Grimm, *Kinder- und Hausmärchen*, No. 81; Uhland, *Schriften*, Vol. VIII, p. 617; Kögel, *Gesch. d. deut. Lit.*, Vol. I, Pt. 2, p. 264.—Grimm's hypothesis was first stated in his *Lateinische Gedichte des x. und xi. Jhdts.* (1838), p. 343. In this connection Scherer says: "It does not occur to me to assert that German songs were the basis of the other stories and droll tales [the Latin Modus Liebinc, Modus Florum, Landfrid and Cobbo, Alfrad, found in the Cambridge MS]. But still, generally speaking, I do believe that this Latin minstrelsy is as truly a reflection of German *spielmannspoesie* as that the *Waltharilied* is derived from the German folk-epic." Cf. *Deutsche Studien* (1891)[2], p. 53.

[2] Cf. Jaffé, *Zeitschr. f. deut. Alt.*, Vol. XIV (1869), p. 492, and Winterfeld, *Herrigs Archiv*, Vol. CXIV (1905), p. 26: "Soft blows the west wind and the sun draws warmly on; earth bares her breast and dissolves in her own sweetness. Ruddy spring comes forth dight in festal dress; he strews the earth with flowers and the forest trees with foliage. The beasts build their lair and the sweet birds their nest, piping their marriage-joys throughout the green woods. When such sounds and sights of gladness assail my ears and meet my eyes—alas my heart is given to sighing! For all alone I sit, brooding in study gray; if perchance

So sang a heart-sick girl (or some minstrel for her) about the year of grace 1000. There is nothing of the church or school about the song—nor yet aught of the stock phrase of classical imitation or minstrel cant. It is the formula as old as the hills, as wide as the breath of man: Earth rejoices; my love is dead. Winterfeld calls the poem a "jewel of the modern lyric that is just awaking." I cannot see why it is necessarily modern, or why it is just awaking. It is mediaeval.[1] A girl is sick at heart, or supposed to be so.[2] Her love, or her baby, or her faith is dead. She says so simply and rhythmically. If she had been Alcuin or Wipo or Ekkehard we should have had a school-poem of it. She was herself. Let us be unsurprised.

I raise my head I may not see or hear. O spirit of spring, hear thou my prayer and dismiss it not; 'spite bloom and flower and verdure—my soul swoons within me!"

If this be not the very minting of popular poetry, what may it be? Not over thirty years ago a Tuscan boy sang as he trimmed a hedge, the first quatrain of a love-ballad so similar to this Latin plaint as to be almost identical:

La foresta di frondi s' abbella
Et lo monte verdeggia, ed il prato.
Al sorriso di Maggio bramato
Apre'l seno odoroso ogn' fior.

Cf. Busk, *Folksongs of Italy* (1887), p. 19.

[1] Symonds, who did not know this song but who did magnificent service for the lyrics of the *Carmina burana*, writes in his *Wine, Women, and Song* (1884, pp. 1 f.): "When we try to picture to ourselves the intellectual and moral state of Europe in the Middle Ages, some fixed and almost stereotyped ideas immediately suggest themselves. We think of the nations immersed in a gross mental lethargy; passively witnessing the gradual extinction of arts and sciences which Greece and Rome had splendidly inaugurated; allowing libraries and monuments of antique civilization to crumble into dust; while they trembled under a dull and brooding terror of coming judgment, shrank from natural enjoyment as from deadly sin, or yielded themselves with brutal eagerness to the satisfaction of vulgar appetites.

"It is therefore with a sense of surprise, with something like a shock to preconceived opinions, that we first become acquainted with the Latin Songs of the Wandering Students. This literature makes it manifest that the ineradicable appetites and natural instincts of men and women were no less vigorous in fact, though less articulate and self-assertive, than they had been in the age of Greece and Rome, and than they afterwards displayed themselves in what is known as the Renaissance." A similar statement is made by Bartoli in the opening pages of his *I precursori del rinascimento* (1876).

[2] I am mindful of the folly of guessing the sex of the author of a mediaeval poem—a classical instance of which attaches to the *O admirabile Veneris idolum*, which was variously supposed to be expression of artistic fervor on the part of an old Roman who had dug up a statue; the prayer of a man to a saint; and the plea of a girl to a boy—until finally determined to be the simple παιδικόν of a Veronese schoolmaster. And so we may not know that a woman wrote this song, although the lines above quoted seem subtly feminine in imagery, just as the oft-cited verses on homesickness by Otfrid of Weissenburg (*ca.* 830) have the undeniably masculine ring (cf. *Ev.*, i, 18, vss. 25 ff.): Vuolage élilenti l/hárto bistu herti/etc.—"O outland, thou art hard to bear, thou art beyond words unendurable, that may I never dissemble. With woe are they encompassed who give up their home; I have experienced the weight of it, no joy have I had of thee; in thee have I found no other weal than sadness of spirit, a troubled heart and manifold pain."

When Gautier claims that the "poems attributed to Walter Mapes[1] and his sort" were all derived from churchly tropes, he contents himself with citing two songs: one to the courtesan Dulcia, the other of more "temperament and brutal passion":

Nutritur ignis osculo
Et leni tactu virginis;
In suo lucet oculo
Lux luminis.
Non est in toto saeculo
Plus numinis.

Now I have taken Gautier at his word and sought where he directs: in the collection of Flacius,[2] in the *Carmina burana*, and in the songs ascribed to Mapes. I am sore puzzled to find how "*ces poésies sortent de nos tropes.*" Some of them do evidently, because their form, context, content, and diction show such indirect origin at least, but then just as surely some of them do not. In other words certain songs are of scholastic and clerical workmanship, certain are popular. I shall treat of this at length in a later chapter of this study where I find some poems which contain every hint of being *volkslieder*, or of being imitated from popular songs.

To choose for the present but one of many, I turn to a song recently discovered by Vattasso—it is of the twelfth century and entitled *planctus monialis:*

Plangit nonna fletibus
Inenarrabilibus,
Condolens gemitibus,
Dicens consocialibus:
Heu misella!
Nichil est deterius tali vita,
Cum enim sim petulans et lasciva.

Sono tintinnabulum,
Repeto psalterium,
Gratum linquo somnium
Cum dormire cuperem,

[1] Were goliard songs ascribed during the thirteenth century to Walter Mapes because of confusion with that other Walter, also archdeacon of Oxford, from whom Geoffrey of Monmouth (1135–50) had his *Historia regum Britanniae?*

[2] I. e., Flacius Illyricus, *Varia doctorum piorumque virorum de corrupto ecclesiae statu poemata* (1556; reprinted 1754).

Heu misella!
Pernoctando vigilo
Cum non vellem.
Juvenem amplecterer quam libenter.[1]

Amazingly rough in a way, and scarce worthy of printing but for one conspicuous fact. It is the old story of the Nun's Complaint found frequently in French *romance* and German *lied* from the thirteenth century on. It is imitated from some such popular poem without any doubt.

For, near as we should imagine such a theme to be to the poets of the church, the monastery, and the school, when we come to study the matter we find their treatment to be a very different sort. The twelfth-century songs of Hildebert[2] and Hilary[3] to nuns and about them are smooth *vers d'occasion.* Marbod[4] consoles a maiden dedicated to the cloister by picturing the happiness of a marriage with Christ; again, he encourages a girl with pedantic seriousness to adhere to her vows. From the same time we have the Love-Council of Remiremont;[5] we have the poetic letter of a monk to nuns,[6] written in jocose and fluent manner, warning them not to occupy themselves overmuch with the verses of Ovid as these are no prescribed part of the routine. In the thirteenth century we read the prayer of a nun to the Virgin[7] that she may be freed from the temptations of earthly passion—also the story of how the nun, forgetful of her vows, tried to seduce the clerk.[8] And as early as the tenth or eleventh century we have the fragment of a macaronic song (half Latin, half German) in which a clerk pleads with a nun to listen kindly to his wooing, for springtime is at hand and the earth is green anew.[9]

[1] Cf. *Studi medievali*, Vol. I (1904), p. 124; MS Vatican 3,251; de Nolhac, *Labibliot hèque de Fulvio Orsini* (1887), p. 195, n. 2; Novati considers the song *quasi certamente d'origine straniera*, although he gives no reason for this belief.

[2] Cf. Hauréau, *Les mélanges poétiques d'Hildebert de Lavardin* (1882).

[3] Cf. Champollion-Figeac, *Hilarii versus et ludi* (1838).

[4] Migne, *Patrologia*, Vol. CLXXI, p. 1717; Wright, *Anglo-Latin Satirical Poets*, Vol. II (1872), p. 240.

[5] Cf. *Zeitschr. f. deut. Alt.*, Vols. VII, p. 160; XXI, p. 65; Langlois, *Origines et sources du Roman de la Rose* (1891), p. 6.

[6] Cf. *Sitzungsberichte der bayr. Akademie* (1873), pp. 695 ff.

[7] Cf. *Wiener Studien*, Vol. VI, p. 291.

[8] *Anzeiger f. Kunde d. deut. Vorzeit*, Vol. XXV (1878), col. 319; *Sitzungsber. d. Wiener Akad.*, Vol. XXXVI (1861), p. 168; Hagen *Carmin mediia aevi* (1877), p. 206; *Notices et extraits*, Vol. XXIX (1880), Pt. 2, p. 249.

[9] "Cambridger Lieder," No. 32, *Zeitschr. f. deut. Alt.*, Vol. XIV (1869).

Such is the writing of mediaeval clerks and schoolmen when they deal with the nun either in fact or in fancy; graceful *minnelieder* like those of Hilarius to Bona and Superba, exhortations to chastity like Marbod's stiff attempts in leonine hexameters, or allusive (not to say suggestive) efforts to bring about a rendezvous with some plump novice. Nothing intense, no outcry of suffering, and a manner far removed from the popular. Even where as in the tenth-century song there is evident approach to the popular treatment for a moment, the whole ends stiffly with a moralizing touch. Let us dwell in passing with this poem. Grant me love, pleads the clerk, for the birds are singing in the woods. What care I for nightingale? demands the nun. I am the maid of Christ and have sworn to serve him singly. The lover returns to his task with unremitting urgency: But if you will only grant me love I will bestow upon you earthly honors and rewards. Thus the maiden: Such rewards pass away as the clouds are swept from the sky—the kingdom of God endures eternally.

So from tenth century to fifteenth did the poetasters of bench and cell deal with the nun. Not so popular minstrelsy:

La nonain se gaimentoit,
Regardait aval un preit,
Vit lou moinne qui venoit,
Qui avoit son frot esteit.
Longue demoree
Faites, frans moinnes loialz.
Se plus suis nonette,
Ains ke soit li vespres
Je morai des jolis malz.

Thus a romance of the fourteenth century, and one of the thirteenth runs as follows:

Ki nonne me fist, Jesus lou maldie.
Je di trop envis vespres ne conplies:
J'amaixe trop muels moneir bone vie
Ke fust deduissans et amerousete.
Je sent les douls mals leis ma senturete.
Malois soit de deu ki me fist nonnete.[1]

[1] MS 389, City Library of Berne; cf. Wackernagel, *Altfranzösische Lieder und Leiche* (1846), p. 51; Bartsch, *Altfranzösische Romanzen und Pastourellen* (1870), p. 28; MS franc. 20,050, Royal Library of Paris; Jeanroy, *Les origines de la poésie lyrique en France* (1904)², p. 190.

But it is in the German *volkslieder* that we come closest to the spirit and even the phraseology of the *planctus monialis*.

Gott geb ihm ein verdorben jar
Der mich zu einer nunnen macht!
Soll ich ein nunn gewerden
Dann wider meinen willen,
So will ich auch einem knaben jung
Seinen kummer stillen.

And even more popular than this song was perhaps:

Ich solt ein nonne werden,
Ich hatt kein lust darzu,
Ich ess nicht gerne gerste,[1]
Wach auch nicht gerne fru.[2]

A comparison of these and other *nonnenlieder* with the Vattasso song will convince one that the latter owes its spirit to the vernacular ballads and ditties having to do with the cloister, even though our earliest known example of such be from the thirteenth century. Popular tradition was as tenacious as school tradition at least; we find formulae in both continuing with identical verbiage for centuries. The fact that we have no vernacular popular song regarding the nun before the thirteenth century does not mean there was no such—in fact we have indubitable evidence that there was, just from the lines of this Vattasso song itself. The Latin dance ballad of the year 1019 discovered by Schröder was previously known to Du Méril from the MS of an English translation of Grosseteste's *Manuel de pechie* (about 1400). And now we are able to add another popular Latin ballad of the same sort from the eleventh or twelfth century, in this *planctus monialis*.

More proof—and there is plenty—that there was a popular Latin poetry throughout the Middle Ages need not be adduced at just this point, as it would transcend the limits of the present purpose.[3] Suffice it to call attention to the study of Winterfeld's

[1] Cf. verse 44 of the Vattasso song: *e succis farinulae et caseo.*

[2] Uhland, *Volkslieder*, Nos. 328, 329.

[3] Just a word as to the famous *liebesgruss* from *Ruodlieb* which R. M. Meyer (I believe rightly) cited as a remnant of popular lyricality. It may not, to be sure, be a "relic of ancient communal poetry" simply because analogous love-messages are discoverable in Indian poetry—so far Meyer's critics may be justified in doubting. But no more need the *liebesgruss* in *Ruodlieb* be of learned origin, just because parallel passages can be found in the Bible, in classical Latin poets, and in mechanical hexameters of Carolingian versifiers

with which the next chapter deals, to a previous article of mine on the origins of *minnesang*, and to the further songs later on which I shall cite for one reason or another. I am content to establish merely the fact that there were throughout the Middle Ages two sorts of Latin lyric: one which was of the church and the school, no matter how far it finally developed from the form of its original birthplace; the other of the people and laity, whether written by them or by a homely minstrel for them.

We are now ready to review various doctrines which are maintained regarding the mediaeval song and singers, to determine if we may how far they help or hinder us in the enunciation of the fact that before the troubadours and the minnesingers there were Latin songs which were either themselves popular and widely disseminated, or which are *rifacimenti* of vernacular popular songs spread broadcast among the people. And first we may take up the theory of the mime.

THE MEDIAEVAL MIME

More than thirty years ago Scherer wrote his important statement of the rôle which the Italian mime played in the development of early German literature.[1] Little by little the conviction

(cf. Dümmler, *Mitteilungen der Züricher antiquarischen Gesellschaft*, Vol. XII, p. 228; Liersch, *Zeitschr. f. deut. Alt.*, Vol. XXXVI, pp. 154 ff.). The author of the first European novel need not have got his love-message from any of the three places above mentioned, nor even necessarily from a fourth place suggested by Kögel (*Gesch. d. deut. Lit.*, Vol. I, Part 2, p. 139): viz., from a wandering student, nor from a fifth place, from the French love-greeting which Paul Meyer believed to have no connection with popular verses (*Le salut d'amour dans les littératures provençale et française*, 1867, p. 4; cf. also Diez, *Die Poesie der Troubadours*, 1883², p. 149). It may be the Latin adaptation of a German *volkslied*-stanza, or it may be the original labor of its writer. But whatever its immediate source, one thing it must be: the congener of scores of other popular songs such as we have documented a-plenty from later centuries (cf. Müllenhoff-Scherer, *Denkmäler*, Vol. II³, p. 152); it is the very stamp of popular love-poetry even if it were first born at the moment of its writing. Let us acknowledge, if you will, that such verses as the following are of clerical workmanship:

Multiplici Christus reddat tibi munera mitis,
In me quot bonitas contulit ecce tua.
Gramina quot tellus habeat, vel litus harenas,
Tot, miserante deo, David, habeto vale;

but the *Ruodlieb* stanza has a different smack:

Dic sodes illi nunc de me corde fideli
Tantundem *liebes*, veniat quantum modo *loubes*,
Et volucrum *wunna* tot sint, tot dic sibi *minna;*
Graminis et florum quantum sit, dic et honorum;

as has the popularizing love message in the *Carmina burana*, no. 82, despite its classical allusions:

Quot sunt flores in Hyblae vallibus,
Quot redundat Dodona frondibus,
Et quot pisces natant aequoribus,
Tot abundat amor doloribus.

[1] *Geschichte der deutschen Dichtung im xi. und xii. Jahrhundert* (1875), pp. 11 ff. Cf. also Grysar, "Der römische Mimus," *Sitzungsber. d. Wiener Akad.*, Vol. XII, pp. 331 ff.

grew that after the fall of the Roman Empire the mimes spread northward throughout Germany bringing a new element to the life and literature which they found there. And so the picture took shape which represents the repertory and the art of the German minstrel in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries as the resultant of two forces: the lofty epic idealism of the Teutonic *scop;* the vulgar but contagious realism of the Italian *joculator.*[1]

There is something in this theory of continuance and new birth through the mingling of two elements, either of which might soon have proved sterile but for fructification from a new seed, which satisfies the imagination, so that we may not wonder at the quick adoption of it.[2] Germanists are now possessed of a thread which will lead them safely through the dim chambers of mediaeval centuries, as they seek for an explanation of hardly understood literary phenomena. Many of them cling therefore tenaciously to this tenuous cord, often in secret dread of its breaking, but openly smiling whenever the classicist is heard to demand that the Roman mime be dead along with the ashes of the empire which had cherished him. For does not your Germanist remember that this very empire led a shadowy but real existence into the nineteenth century? And why then, he asks, should these funmakers have yielded up their spirit just the moment that the fall of Rome opened to them new fields of effort.

Up to this point, then, those whose special study was mediaeval poetry were willing, ofttimes anxious, to accept the services of the exiled Italian mime in the fetching of certain lyric and dramatic forms from antiquity to the Middle Ages. Even those who believed there were many other agencies of transmission yet included the mime. Peddler and beggar, scribe and journeyman

[1] Cf. Chambers, *The Medieval Stage* (1903), Vol. I, pp. 23 ff., and the bibliography there cited, which omits strangely enough any reference to Hertz's *Spielmannsbuch*[2] (1900), with its incomparable notes (pp. 315 ff.).

[2] In his review of Anderson's *Anglo-Saxon Scop* (*Anzeiger f. d. Alt.*, Vol. XXXI [1907], p. 114) Heusler propounds three matters which must be thoroughly investigated before we can gain an adequate picture of this early renaissance of minstrelsy: (1) How the old-style poetizing and harp-playing German vassal is to be separated from the *joculator*, the inheritor of southern culture; (2) How a historical poetry dealing with contemporary events affected heroic song; (3) In how far the poet-singer lived by his art, so that we can suppose there existed a professional practice of poetry in any strict sense. Not till these problems are at least partially settled should we speak too glibly of co-operation between scop and mime.

'prentice, vagrom monk and missionary, scop and soldier, tourist and student, artisan and hireling—in this freemasonry of travel the mime should surely hold high rank as propagator of entertainment, but should he be the only one who spun edifying yarns, who caroled snatches of song learned in many lands? A sorry sort of Canterbury pilgrimage, many thought, in which the mime was solitary pilgrim. And yet this is the very point of recent insistence.

The long-awaited book of Reich is come,[1] and with it a mime who like Alexander Selkirk is sole monarch of all he surveys. The concluding part of the work is yet unpublished, but there is sufficient in the first volume to occupy our attention. The mime, it seems, like the long-unsuspected bacillus, is everywhere. In places untrodden of Caliban and Ariel there lurks the mime—the whole spiritual world has become, as it were, mime and non-mime; to our convenient totalities of day and night, land and sea, time and eternity, a new unit has been added. Reich has had till now but time to hunt through twenty-eight or thirty centuries, and yet he has discovered that anything dramatic in the world's literature which is not to be termed "classic" or "classic imitation" is based upon the mime. The process of this argument is simple, but could such a dictum be pronounced except in a time when literary criticism is unduly influenced by purely speculative reasoning? Verily does it seem as if in the twentieth century Mercury and Philology have been remarried and every previous edict of divorce between them annulled.

If the words of the foregoing paragraph be true, why not pass Reich's book lightly by? Because, first, he has in his discussion of the Middle Ages really found an explanation for a definite expression in literature which is otherwise puzzling; second, he has succeeded in converting to his doctrine of an ever-present mime no less a person than Winterfeld.[2]

[1] *Der Mimus: Ein Litterarentwickelungsgeschichtlicher Versuch*, Vol. I (1903).

[2] Cf. "Hrotsvits literarische Stellung," *Herrigs Archiv*, Vol. CXIV (1905), pp. 48 ff.

I imagine that when the history of mediaeval philology is finally written the name of the late Paul von Winterfeld will shine more brightly than that of many another scholar to whom a longer life was granted and whose writings largely outnumber his. No other investigator in this field combined in so unusual a degree a severe training and a scholary purpose with surety of instinct, brilliance of imagination, and rare poetic gifts. It would seem as if

This last is, I confess, a blow, the more so, because Winterfeld in the natural ardor of his new conversion does not stop midway in his claims, but says all that is best in the Latin artistic poetry of the Middle Ages, the best part of Notker and Roswitha, comes straight from the mime. He then proceeds to assert that the mime cultivated practically every form of literary expression known to mediaeval times and that he gave to each the impetus that brought it to its zenith.

It is at first difficult to find the fallacy which underlies much of Winterfeld's argument, but after some study two faults become clear. First, that the word "mime" is often used not only in a wide but in an evasive sense—discussion of this will be taken up in a following paragraph. Second, we discover that Winterfeld without reason and without proof claims for this mime things that quite evidently belong to someone else. Certain expressions which Winterfeld assigns to the mime were undoubtedly cultivated by him *sicut fabulae testantur et scurrarum cumplices:* notably the short tale, the farce, the sequence devoted to profane matters, satirical poetry, the novel in hexameters, the dramatic skit, and some of the popular legends. There is small necessity for denying the minstrel his fair share in the purely popular grist of novelistic and narrative literature which preceded the twelfth century.[1] At the same time it takes hardihood to deliver Notker and Roswitha so completely into his hands, to say nothing of the goodly company of story-tellers who must have found amateurish amusement in literature without using it as a professional means of livelihood.[2]

his death, coming so shortly before that of the better-known mediaevalist, Ludwig Traube, so soon after that of Ernst Dümmler, wrought irreparable injury to the cause of mediaeval Latin in the university world, where it was but beginning to be ardently espoused. One can but cherish the fond hope that these three did not depart before they had sown the seed of their strength in the hearts of a younger generation of students come to carry on their work.

[1] In addition to Winterfeld's article above cited, cf. *Modern Philology*, Vol. III, pp. 429–33.

[2] It is perhaps an unavoidable tendency, when chronicling the story of literature of any age, to insist overmuch on the ascendency of certain groups of men as the makers of certain sorts of prose and poetry. We consequently are apt to visualize any particular generation of poetizing as the result of the efforts of some narrow guild or school. Thus a kind of German epic poetry we assign entirely during the older period to the *scop* or *vorsänger;* later to the *spielmann*. A kind of Latin lyric in mediaeval Europe goes first to the *mimus* and later to the goliard. Love-songs are given initially to the minnesinger, afterward to

Certain expressions, however, which belonged to another than the mime but which Winterfeld in his generosity surrenders to him are the hymn of victory, the ecclesiastical ballad, and the Carolingian eclogue. Of course some one poet or minstrel is to be presumed for any poem, and if one wishes he may dub such poet "mime." But there is in our minds an inferential connection of this word with *mimus*, meaning an Italian vaudeville performer, who, after the fall of the western empire, spread northward across Europe. And to assert that such a person necessarily composed the *Ballad of Fontenoy*, the *Victory of Pippin over the Avari*, the *Descent of Christ into Hell*, *Terence and the Delusor*, etc.—this is but to speak from the pulpit.[1] Not a shred of evidence is adduced that would convict this mime of the authorship of such matters, if he were haled before the court.

Let us examine the pretensions of the mime to the authorship of the eclogue, and choose this particular case not because it is the weakest one that Winterfeld sets forth, but rather, if my feeling is right, the strongest. In case we can return the verdict "not proven" on this count, I think the others too may stand dismissed.

The dramatic dialogue known as the eclogue was from the beginning, Winterfeld says, the child of the mime. The eclogues of the Syracusan poet Sophron were popular in tone and were performed before an audience. But, although modeled upon these, the eclogues of Theocritus and Herodas were highly artistic and without popular appeal; they were *kunstpoesie*. Now these

the meistersinger. Such a delivering of all the known material of a time to set classes or professions of people is only unwise in that it blinds our eyes to the fact that the poetry of any age is too complex in the weaving to be ascribed to a single order. Forgetful of this truth, we do not sufficiently try to establish distinctions between different sorts of poetry, since we think of them at any one moment as a single unit. And we thus lose often the thread of continuity which might otherwise lead us from one century to another.

A good illustration of such procedure, I believe, confronts us in our present study of mime and goliard. We speak of a certain large body of Latin poetry as if it were the sole product of their effort. This poetry thus becomes at once an artistic, artificial, almost professional matter, and we find difficulty in convincing ourselves, except after the most patient examination, that some of it at least was popular, sincere in feeling, with the stamp of the people's mint upon it. If there be the latter sort, as I am claiming, then this it was that foreran documented German *minnesang*, and not that other sort of polished *vers d'occasion* so commonly thought of when the mediaeval Latin lyric is mentioned.

[1] I must reserve for another occasion further study of "the Merovingian mime." The materials already gathered on this subject are too bulky to permit of presentation here.

were imitated in learned fashion by Virgil, Calpurnius, and Nemesianus, and we thus gain a new sort of eclogue—one that is not acted, but intended for reading only, *buchpoesie*. This, in a nutshell, is the story of such dialogue poetry before the fall of Rome.

In the eighth and ninth centuries we find six dialogue poems which with some violence may be grouped together as eclogues: the writings of Naso Modoinus, the debate between summer and winter, sometimes ascribed to Alcuin, the bucolic verses of Theodul (or Gottschalk),[1] the lively tilt between Terence and a *delusor*, Radbert's *Life of Adalhard*, and the *Life of Hadumod* by Agius. Now four of these eclogues are evidently but a learned imitation of the bookish poetry of Virgil, Nemesianus, etc., adapted to the local needs of the writers of the Carolingian renaissance; but two of them—the *Conflictus veris et hiemis* and the *delusor* are mimetic. The former of these two is naught but a Latinized version of the popular Germanic struggle between the seasons, which was often presented in costume; the latter Winterfeld assumes was acted and believes Terence to be but the literary representative of the mime—cursed and scolded and threatened by the *delusor* until he ran off the scene in fright. On the basis of this interpretation he assigns the poem to the repertory of the vaudeville performer.

Why should we believe Terence to be but the symbol of just that which he and his comedies were most opposed to, viz., the lascivious Roman vaudeville? I know of no possible ground for such an assumption. There is not a scrap of inward or outward evidence in connection with this poem, that it is anything other than just what it seems to be: a scoring of the poet Terence on the charge of looseness by some *delusor*. I believe Terence, in other words, to be Terence; but gladly should I learn who or what is meant by *delusor;* and on this point Winterfeld utters not a syllable.

To sum up: Winterfeld begins his discussion of the eclogue with a Syracusan poet who wrote popular eclogues about B. C. 440. He then deals with Sophron's imitators. When the Ger-

[1] If a clever surmise of Winterfeld's be right: θεός = Gott; δοῦλος = Schalk.

man empires are built upon the ruins of Rome, he says that the eclogue is dead but that the mime is alive. And then, because he finds a school-rendering into Latin of a German *streitgedicht* and a scene in which Terence is belabored by one whose motives we do not understand, he demands that a line of continuity be established for popular vaudeville from Sophron to the end of the ninth century. Should we not rather believe that the "mime" had nothing to do with the matter of the Carolingian eclogue, but that the scholars of this time made variations on the *ecloga* of Virgil, because they held with the palace academy that he was the greatest poet of antiquity?[1]

In reading the "arguments" of Reich and Winterfeld we are often confused by the way in which they use the adjective *mimetic* and the noun *mime*. Great care must be taken not to regard these terms as interchangeable. Mimetic material may at any time become actually a mime—just as dramatic material may at any time become a drama. But while such a *streitgedicht* as that between summer and winter might conceivably become a thoroughgoing mime by the infusion of a certain known element or two, it never did become mime so far as we know, any more than it becomes drama. And while there is a certain knock-down humor in the *delusor* poem which allows us to dream with Winterfeld that the figure of Terence did wear the comic mask of the vulgar actor and did set his audience into spasms of uncontrollable laughter with his caperings and his mouthings, there is not a particle of evidence that the poem was acted at all. And as to Sophron: why rattle his dry bones to attract attention to a mediaeval poem?

Who and what is this mime, this lord of hosts that confronts us in a hundred forms? Well, mimus, it seems, is both a mimetic performance and a mimetic performer—both vaudeville skit and vaudeville artist. Do we not now begin to understand how so wide a sphere of influence may be claimed for mime? And in the Middle Ages the term was measurably widened until it

[1] The Carolingian poets assiduously imitated every classical model that they knew. Why then should we seek a special explanation if we find that they copied the eclogue form? Or why should we call a popular *streitgedicht* an eclogue merely because they are both dialogue poems?

betokens any stunt (the word is used advisedly) or turn that can wheedle a laugh, a sigh, or a tear from the audience; until it means any function of the mimetic performer, no matter how meretricious or venal, just so that it entertains. Mime came thus to be synonymous with the modern vernacular "show," as employed by careless youth to denominate anything from a church sociable to a football game. In neither case are we to debate what correct usage prescribes concerning the two words; we are merely to read mediaeval records pertaining to the word *mimus*. And the *mimi* of these records when referring to persons can often not be translated by a less wide term than "artists" or "players," for they comprised musicians of every kind, trapeze-performers, acrobats, singers, slackrope walkers, tumblers, knife-throwers, contortionists, clowns, merry-andrews, pantomimists, dancers, jugglers, sleight-of-hand workers, harlequins, buffoons, bear-leaders, monologists—until because of the narrow view-point of the ascetic churchman the word finally came to connote confidence men, pickpockets, shell-workers, second-story men, outcasts, guzzlers, lechers, *et cetera ad infinitum*.[1]

The crux is solved. The mime it was that influenced all the popular themes of the Middle Ages, that is at work today as "the basis of all themes in the world's literature not designedly classic;" for we have found by studying the documents that mime means almost anything that we have no other name for. It is the old story over again. A word is evolved by someone and restricted to a certain specified meaning; then following generations come to widen the term's horizon to suit their own sweet whim. In discovering their sort of "mime" Reich and Winterfeld have but displaced other words, one of which is the adjective "romantic."

Herzog says without doubt too peremptorily: "The *mimi* and *joculatores* of the dark occidental Middle Ages had nothing to do with the ancient mime."[2] For they comprised, so far as we

[1] Cf. Glock "Über den Zusammenhang des römischen Mimus und einer dramatischen Tätigkeit mittelalterlicher Spielleute mit dem neueren komischen Drama," *Zeitschr. f. vergl. Literaturgesch.* (1905), pp. 25–45, 172–93. For the various Latin synonyms of *mimus* cf. Gautier, *Les épopées françaises*[2] (1892), Vol. II, pp. 10 ff.

[2] *Berliner philologische Wochenschrift* (1904), No. 34.

may ever know, much the same sort of profession. But even if they did the very same sort of thing, they did it so differently that comparison is unwise. By this I mean that the entertainers in mediaeval Europe may conceivably be the very descendants of the entertainers ages before in Italy; but we shall certainly learn what they meant to the life of their time better by studying them in cross-section than longitudinally.

There remains a most important matter in connection with the Latin mime or minstrel, viz., his influence on the musicality of lyrical ballads previous to the twelfth century. I reserve statement of this for a later paragraph.[1]

THE GOLIARDS

As early as the tenth century perhaps, but quite certainly as early as the eleventh,[2] we know that the goliards were composing and singing Latin verses. I do not think it necessary to believe with Giesebrecht that the goliard movement originated in the schools of France during the twelfth century,[3] but it may be well to imagine that it was there and at that time that the movement gained its greatest impetus and its widest currency.

The young universities of Bologna and Salerno, founded partly on the private academies of the older grammarians and teachers of rhetoric, partly on the cloisters and canonical schools,[4] attracted during the twelfth century large numbers of students (clerks) who would learn jurisprudence and medicine. But at the same period clerks from every country of Europe poured into northern France to learn dialectic and theology, grammar and rhetoric, at the

[1] Cf. *infra*, pp. 50 f.

[2] It seems unnecessary to go into the question of the councils which make for the earlier of these two dates; cf. Chambers, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 61; Allen "Origins of German Minnesang," *Modern Philology*, Vol. III, p. 18; Traube's review of Manitius' *Amarcius* (*Anzeiger f. deutsches Altertum*, Vol. XV [1889], p. 200), from which I quote: "When this *jocator* of the eleventh century (*ca.* 1050) begins his performance with a song about Goliath (*Amarcius*, 439: *straverit ut grandem pastoris funda Goliath*), we discover here material which has been really treated by others of his kind. This material either came later to determine the title 'goliardus' or this name was already in vogue and caused the minstrels to set up a connection of it with Goliath." See especially, however, Manly, "Familia Goliae," *Modern Philology*, Vol. V, pp. 201 ff.

[3] "Die Vaganten oder Goliarden und ihre Lieder," *Allgemeine Monatsschrift für Wissenschaft und Literatur* (1853), pp. 10 ff.

[4] Cf. Giesebrecht, *De litterarum studiis apud Italos primis medii aevi saeculis* (1845), pp. 15 f.

French schools, which ranked little, if any, lower than the Italian institutions. Paris was considered the fount of worldly wisdom, and we are told that Athens and Alexandria in their palmy days contained not so many searchers after knowledge. Rheims and Orleans shared in lesser measure the reputation of their greater sister.

Now this was just the sort of environment which we imagine most favorable for the birth and spread of a certain fashion of goliardic poetry.[1] Even were we prone to doubt that such a soil produced hundreds and thousands of school-poems, the opposite would be shown true by a mere examination of the records. Peter of Blois, Stephan and Bertier of Orleans, and Walter of Châtillon[2] were known for their Latin lyrics of the lighter manner. Fulbert of Chartres, Marbod of Rennes, and Arnulf of Lisieux declaimed of spring and wine, although generally in metrical lines; Abelard,[3] Bernard of Clairvaux,[4] and Hildebert of Tours wrote *vers d'occasion*, emulating the graceful diction of Ovid and Horace.[5] And a presumable peer of any spark in wit and elegance was young Hilary.

Scarcely were such poems born before they fled across the Channel with the returning English students to become the marvel

[1] For the picture of a like materialistic age when satirical and erotic songs may well have existed among the lower *clerici* read of the tenth century in Poole, *Illustrations of the History of Medieval Thought* (1884), pp. 79 ff.

[2] Cf. the poem on scholastic studies in Wright, *Anecdota Literaria* (1844); also Mûldener, *Die zehn Gedichte Walthers von Lille* (1859), and Hubatsch, *Die lateinischen Vagantenlieder des Mittelalters* (1870), p. 8:

Inter quos sunt quatuor rythmice dictantium,
Qui super hoc retinent sibi privilegium:
Stephanus flos scilicet Aurelianensium
Et Petrus qui dicitur de castro Blecensium.
Istis non immerito Berterus adjicitur,
Sed nec inter alios apte praetermittitur
Ille quem Castellio latere non patitur,
In cujus opusculo Alexander legitur.

Cf. also the famous phrase of Walther: *perstrepuit modulis Gallia tota meis;* Peiper, *Walther von Châtillon* (1869); Bellanger, *De magistro Gualthero ab Insulis* (1877); Thurot, *Revue critique* (1870) I, p. 123.

[3] "Quorum etiam carminum pleraque adhuc in multis, sicut et ipse nosti frequentantur et decantantur regionibus, ab his maxime quos vita similis oblectat." "Amatorio metro vel rhythmo composita reliquisti carmina quae, prae nimia suavitate tam dictaminis quam cantus saepius frequentata, tuum in ore omnium nomen incessanter tenebant." The first of these statements is Abelard's own, the other that of Heloise; *Abaelardi Opera*, pp. 12, 46, and DuMéril, *Poésies populaires latines du moyen age* (1847), p. 422.

[4] Cf. the long statement in Berengarii, *Apologeticum Abaelardi*, regarding the *cantiunculas mimicas et urbanos modulos* of young Bernard. Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, Vol. CLXXVIII; Hauréau, *Des poèmes latins attribués à S. Bernard* (1890), pp. iii f.

[5] Cf. Hauréau, *Mélanges poétiques d'Hildebert de Lavardin* (1882).

of those who had not had the means or the initiative to go abroad to learn. And these songs were copied, and imitated, and put forth often in new guise, as their presence in many English manuscripts bears witness. Soon came the great popular movements in England during the end of the twelfth and the earlier half of the thirteenth centuries to give added impetus to the dissemination of such poems, and the result was manifest in hundreds of congeners remarkable for pungency of satire and sprightliness of composition.[1] Italy also shared in the writing of similar verses, although these poems are of a more ascetic sort, and have to do with civil and churchly matters.[2] And many indications point clearly to the share that Germany took in the movement.[3]

It is generally believed that vagrant clerks and dissolute students composed a great part of the body of mediaeval Latin lyric from the eleventh or twelfth century on.[4] And perhaps

[1] Cf. Wright, *Poems commonly attributed to Walter Mapes* (1841), p. v.

[2] Cf. Straccali, *I Goliardi ovvero i clerici vagantes delle Università medievali* (1880) pp. 59 ff.; Ronca, *Cultura medioevale e poesia latina d'Italia nei secoli xi e xii* (1892), Vol. I, p. 255; *Studi medievali*, Vol. I (1904), p. 119.

[3] It will suffice to quote one of the various poems which deal with study in France—this time evidently sung by a Swabian lad on his way to Paris:

Hospita in Gallia
Nunc me vocant studia.
Vadam ergo;
Flens a tergo
Socios relinquo.
Plangite discipuli,
Lugubris discidii
Tempore propinquo.

Vale, dulcis patria,
Suavis Suevorum Suevia!
Salve, dilecta Francia,
Philosophorum curia!
Suscipe discipulum
In te peregrinum,
Quem post dierum circulum
Remittes Socratinum.

Cf. *Zeitsch. f. deut. Alt.*, Vol. V, p. 296; Laistner, *Golias: Studentenlieder des Mittelalters* (1879), p. 53; Meyer, *Fragmenta burana* (1901), p. 180.

It is my belief that the supreme evidence of Germany's part in the Franco-Latin lyrical renaissance of the twelfth century is found in the Cologne archpoet's unforgettable productions. But I doubt if the tangled skeins of the *archipoeta-Golias* controversy will ever be unraveled before a new Revelation comes. Those who care to become entangled in the discussion regarding the paternity of the great mediaeval poet may consult with profit Wright, *Latin Poems commonly attributed to Walter Mapes*, London, 1841; J. Grimm, *Gedichte des Mittelalters auf König Frederich I*, Berlin 1843; Wackernagel, *Zeitschr. f. deut. Alt.*, Vol. V (1845), pp. 293 ff.; Giesebrecht, *Allg. Monatsschrift f. Wiss. u. Lit.*, Braunschweig, 1853; Büdinger "Über einige Reste der Vagantenpoesie in Österreich," *Wiener Sitzungsberichte* (1854); Delisle, *Bibl. de l'École des Chartes*, Vols. XXIX (1868), pp. 596 ff.; XXXI, pp. 303 ff.; *Annuaire bulletin d. l. Société de l'Histoire de France* (1869), pp. 139 ff.; Hubatsch, *Lateinische Vagantenlieder*, Görlitz, 1870; Hauréau "Un manuscrit de la Reine Christine," *Notices et extraits*, Vol. XXIX, Pt. 2 (1880); G. Paris, *Bibl. de l'École des Chartes* (1889), pp. 258 ff. Langlois "La littérature goliardique," *Revue bleue*, Vol. L (1892); Santangelo, *Studio sulla poesia goliardica*, Palermo, 1902; Spiegel, *Der Ursprung des Vagantentums*, Würzburg, 1888, *Die Vaganten und ihr Orden*, Schweinfurt, 1902; W. Meyer, *Göttinger Nachrichten* (1907), pp. 75 ff., etc.

[4] Not so Wilh. Meyer (cf. "Die Oxforder Gedichte des Primas," *Göttinger Nachrichten Phil.-hist. Kl.*, 1907, pp. 76, 88): "Others held the opinion that these Latin songs were composed by students or runaway monks or clerks who were without means and often much

they did, at least in so far as this lyric concerns the more artistic ballad pieces and satires so well known to us;[1] poems full of classical reminiscences, with interlacing rhymes, and artistic in structure. We may imagine if we will that an endless chain of peripatetic minstrels wandered forth from school and monastery, gaining their precarious bread by the tireless recitation of erotic poems.[2] I confess that this does not quite win my credence,

demoralized and degenerate. They are supposed to wander about the country (*Vaganten*) and find precarious support from day to day by the generous gifts they elicited through the singing of Latin songs. Thus is our literary history gradually come to the odd view that profane mediaeval poems in Provençal, French, and German were written chiefly by noble people, but the Latin ones by tatterdemalions (*Lumpen*).

"But, generally speaking, it is to be hoped that critics will finally cease referring the mediaeval Latin songs, particularly those that treat of wine, women, and gaming, on the one hand to a single poet such as the scholarly Walter of Châtillon, or on the other hand to beggarly vagabonds. These songs are, to be sure, composed by persons well versed in the Latin tongue, but such people were at that time the intellectual flower of Germany, France, and England. Above all, the majority and the most ardent of these lyrics we certainly owe to the young students. But at that period, as at all times, many older men as well, ecclesiastics, jurists, physicians, loved poetry and contributed many a flower to the rich garland of mediaeval Latin verse. Teachers of Latin were pre-eminently called to such a task, teachers of elegance of style and of poetry, for which posts professional poets were best adapted; and in such a company the *Primas* (Hugo of Orleans) seems to belong."

I confess I do not just grasp Meyer's reasoning. He is willing to concede that young students and older clerks wrote the songs, but objects to assigning them to beggarly and dissolute monks and clerks. These deprecatory adjectives have been so largely used by critics when speaking of the authors of some of these songs, because the themes of them presuppose rather graceless people, and because we are constantly advised that the young students and clerks were anything but a quiescent and moral lot. Parodies on hymns and masses, sodomitic allusions and pederastic pieces, odes to sexual intercourse, scoffing at calendered saints, begging for hats, coats, and trunks wherewith to cover nakedness, riotous drinking-songs, macaronic ditties with the nastier half in the vernacular tongue; blasphemy, braggadocio, and bluff! Would Wilh. Meyer have us believe these the carefully prepared pieces of quiet souls? And who may persuade us that runaway monks and scampish clerks were not possessed of even more flashing mental brilliancy than those who stayed within the walls of cell and study?

[1] I am not here discussing, nor thinking of, the greater pieces associated with the names of Golias, Archipoeta, and Primas. For such genial and learned endeavor one or more scholars of unusual attainment must be posited, whether Mapes, or Serlo, or Walter, or Alanus, or Philip of Grève, or Hugo of Orleans—or another like them that we shall probably never know. Nor am I thinking of other larger and student-lamp-erudite pieces. I have in mind the real lyrics and shorter ballads, and pungent satirical bits such as could be and would be sung today, if a real understanding of the original texts and melodies might come to us.

[2] These vagabond students and clerks need not always (or even often) have been the *authors* of the pieces they sang and recited. In a sense these lyrics were *volkslieder*—or popularizing songs at any rate. *Schnaderhüpfel* sung by peasants in southern Germany today have been the product of poets like Castelli and Stelzhammer; folk-songs which a nation industriously hums, frequently without thought of their authorship, spring from Goethe, Uhland, Heine, Eichendorff, etc. This may well have been somewhat the state of things in mediaeval Europe. As romantic poets of recent days write *kostümlieder* by the thousand, songs full of wandering minstrels, postillions, miller-lads, huntsmen, etc., so doubtless did certain professional poets of an older age turn off roundelays and madrigals having to do with clerks and students and their adventures in foreign climes.

for this theory seems based overmuch upon the belief that in the twelfth century and thereafter none but professional students of one sort and another could write, ape, or understand Latin verses. But we may let this current doctrine pass, although before it be accepted fully more conclusive proof should be demanded.[1]

There was presumably never an *ordo vagorum*—a close-knit fraternity of goliards. Such a thing is hinted at in but few songs and in such a way as to suggest a waggish jest and not sobriety. We know, too, that there were orders of all kinds promulgated by mediaeval literature as a fling at the different monastic orders. There was, for instance, an *ordo stultorum*, but who would imagine that the twenty-seven classes of its membership really set sail in the *narrenschiff* for Narragonia! The *Liber vagatorum* tells us of an order of beggars that had twenty-eight kinds of tramps.[2] Then there was the Ass's guild with its varying badges and insignia to show the world what an Independent Order of Odd Fellows it boasted of. There were many sorts of mock religious orders, like those in the *Land of Cockagne* and in other popular poems,[3] but who would claim a real existence in fact for them? In other words a joke is a joke, even if it be misunderstood; and it seems strange that nothing less than trephining may convince some that there never was a guild of goliards.

Then certain others still believe bishop Golias to be a historical person and perhaps will continue in this faith, even after reading Mr. Manly's recent relegation of him to the Old Testament.[4] But surely if he did live again in mediaeval times he was nearly related to the *abbas cucaniensis* and to the *praesul concu-*

[1] In his *Dark Ages* Maitland is ever on the track of such cocksure orthodoxy. Cf. p. 32 of his book (5th ed., 1890), where he demands evidence for the flat statement of Robinson: "During the ages we are contemplating persons of the highest rank and in the most eminent stations could not read or write." Now, as a matter of fact, Latin songs of a light variety may have thriven more widely and earlier than is commonly supposed because (1) as presented by the minstrel they were undoubtedly aided by gesture, vernacular interpolation, pantomime, and dance; (2) these songs would be patiently listened to even by audiences blissfully ignorant of their meaning, much as German, French, and Italian pieces are eagerly heard by "musicale" gatherings today.

[2] Cf. Ave-Lallement, *Geschichte des deutschen Gaunertums* (1858).

[3] Cf. for example Nos. 209 and 210 in Uhland's *Volkslieder:*

Wir wollen ein klösterlein bauen
von lauter schönen jungfrauen;
ein solcher orden wollen wir han, etc.

[4] Cf. "Familia Goliae" in *Modern Philology*, Vol. V, pp. 201 ff.

caniae,[1] of whom he once begged a mantle. He belonged, then, to the same court as that which harbored the *prince de sots* and the *roi de ribauds*—being perchance their chaplain. He served indifferently the *king of harlottes* and the *roi petaud* and lived for some years in the *empire de Galilée*. His spiritual master must have been the *papa scholasticus*, his sister in the flesh was the *abbess of Avignon brothels*, and the parentage of the *boy bishoppe* may well be ascribed to him. Once when on a pilgrimage of state he was royally received by the queen of Geneva trulls.[2]

But if the Latin minstrels of the eleventh and twelfth centuries did not constitute a guild, they are still imagined by many to be ever upon the march. They studied jurisprudence at Bologna, medicine at Salerno, dialectic at Rheims, grammar at Orleans, and theology at Paris.[3] The face of Europe was dotted with teachers of rhetoric and the roads leading to their schools were black with graceless students wending their way thither—perhaps. But while there is an evident connection between some, even much, of mediaeval literature and such clerks, there is no need of insisting upon such a connection in the case of many Latin songs. Many lyrics were composed by scholars, many more were not. Every learner was not a minstrel any more than every minstrel was a learner. Below I am going to differentiate with what sharpness I may between goliardic poetry and popular Latin poetry. Meanwhile it is doubtless best to pause and see what can be done to rectify the general impression that the Latin lyric is a great insoluble mass, a corporate entity from which one cannot detach certain groups to study as examples of national expression.

Suppose we begin by dividing this mass into three parts, labeling one *Religious and Didactic*, another *Satire*, and the third *Ballads of Love, Spring, and Wine*. With some study of the

[1] Cf. *Carmina burana* (1847), No. 196; and the *Ridmus episcopi Gulii* (Werner *Beitr. z. Kunde d. lat. Lit. d. MA.*[2] [1905], p. 205). On the whole subject of the land of Cockagne see Graf, *Miti, leggende, e superstizioni del medio evo*, Vol. I (1892), pp. 229–38.

[2] He who would learn more of these "historical" prelates and potentates may consult Hertz, *Spielmannsbuch*[2], p. 338.

[3] Or, to quote the caustic monk of Froidmont (12th century): "In Paris these scholars seek liberal arts, in Orleans authors, at Salerno gallipots, at Toledo demons, and in no place decent manners." (Cf. *Biblioth. Cisterc.*, Vol. VII, p. 257.)

material it will be discovered that such a classification has a real existence in fact.

This division, to be sure, excludes much: for instance, narrative and epic poems on ancient subjects, such as the Fall of Troy or the deeds of Alexander; pseudo-historical records of the *gesta* of secular and churchly notables; rhyming prose devoted to the praise of continence, chess, mathematics, early-rising, grammar, and quasi-scientific study; alphabetic stanzas, acrostics, centos, catalogues of birds and beasts, epigrams, epitaphs, glosses, riddles, versified letters—in fact the most stilted poetry of the school routine; poetry forged when it was cold and beaten into shape with a hammer; verse which is the vehicle for every farrago of mediaeval nonsense; folderol of magic, incantations, natural history games, long descriptive pieces such as the *conflicti*. These and all their like are exempt from our treble division—but who would denominate them lyrics? They are void of the personal appeal and of all immediate interest. They describe no living scene, are without local color, have no *esprit de place*. They have about as much atmosphere as a Leyden jar. We might as well hunt for seventeenth-century Italy in the *Adriatische Rosamund* as seek aught of mediaeval Europe in the withered moss of such strophes. Such poetry as this—if poetry it be—Scherer is brooding on when he says all traces of its immediate origin are hid, but it is not the Latin garb in which it is clothed that hides the source; rather because it is the offscouring of dulness, the vaporing of empty minds.

True to the tenets elsewhere expressed, I believe it desirable to effect a separation of the mediaeval Latin lyric material according to theme and manner of treatment, rather than according to difference in external form. The customary division into metric on the one hand and rhythmic on the other does not appear necessarily distinctive, for our present purpose, at least. A lyric is surely no less a lyric whatever its outward guise. Who would dismiss Fulbert's spring-song from an anthology of mediaeval verse because of its conventional scaffolding?

When the earth, with spring returning, vests herself in fresher sheen,
And the glades and leafy thickets are arrayed in living green;

450

When a sweeter fragrance breatheth flowery fields and vales along,
Then, triumphant in her gladness, Philomel begins her song:
And with thick delicious warble far and wide her notes she flings,
Telling of the happy springtide and the joys that summer brings.
In the pauses of men's slumber deep and full she pours her voice,
In the labor of his travel bids the wayfarer rejoice.
Night and day, from bush and greenwood, sweeter than an earthly lyre,
She, unwearied songstress, carols, distancing the feathered choir,
Fills the hillside, fills the valley, bids the groves and thickets ring,
Made indeed exceeding glorious through the joyousness of spring.[1]

Who would care to suppress from any discussion of the lyric during the Middle Ages the following two poems written four centuries apart, one by Alcuin or Fridugisus, the other by Marbod of Rennes, both of which treat of the healing influences of nature—a theme so common in modern art. Smoothly enough runs on the first:

O mea cella, mihi habitatio dulcis, amata,
Semper in aeternum, o mea cella, vale.
Undique te cingit ramis resonantibus arbos,
Silvula florigeris semper onusta comis.
Prata salutiferis florebunt omnia et herbis,
Quas medici quaerit dextra salutis ope.
Flumina te cingunt florentibus undique ripis,
Retia piscator qua sua tendit ovans.
Pomiferis redolent ramis tua claustra per hortos,
Lilia cum rosulis candida mixta rubris.
Omne genus volucrum matutinas personat odas,
Atque creatorem laudat in ore deum.[2]

[1] Cum telluris, vere novo, producuntur germina,
Nemorosa circumcirca frondescunt et brachia;
Fragrat odor cum suāvis florida per gramina,
Hilarescit Philomela, dulcis sonus conscia:
Et extendens modulando gutturis spiramina,
Reddit veris et aestivi temporis praeconia.
Instat nocti et diei voce sub dulcisona,
Soporatis dans quietem cantus per discrimina,
Necnon pulcra viatori laboris solatia.
Vocis ejus pulcritudo clarior quam cithara;
Vincitur omnis cantando volucrum catervula;
Implet silvas atque cuncta modulis arbustula
Gloriosa valde facta veris prae laetitia.

For appreciative discussion of this and Marbod's song, cf. Trench, *Sacred Latin Poetry*[3] (1874), pp. 47 ff. The translation is by J. M. Neale; cf. his *Mediaeval Hymns and Sequences* (1863).

[2] *Poetae aevi Karolini*, Vol. I (1881), ed. Dümmler, p. 243.

More awkwardly versified is the other, but a deeper earnestness veins it:

Moribus esse feris prohibet me gratia veris,
Et formam mentis mihi mutuor ex elementis.
Ipsi naturae congratulor, ut puto, jure:
Distinguunt flores diversi mille colores,
Gramineum vellus superinduxit sibi tellus,
Fronde virere nemus et fructificare videmus;
Egrediente rosa viridaria sunt speciosa.
Qui tot pulcra videt, nisi flectitur et nisi ridet,
Intractabilis est, et in ejus pectore lis est;
Qui speciem terrae non vult cum laude referre,
Invidet Auctori, cujus subservit honori
Bruma rigens, aestas, auctumnus, veris honestas.[1]

Lack of space alone forbids the listing of other metrical stanzas from the Carolingian poets as well as from those of a later day, which would show how clearly they may be regarded as forerunners of the great modern poets of nature, or even as true interpreters of the beauty of the world in which they dwelt. Francke calls attention to the isolation of the cloisters, to the humble tasks of monks in the way of cultivating the fields, to the close touch in which they came with the outdoor world of fertile valley or wilder summit, as animating causes of the lively sense for nature which many school poems exhibit. If we do but add one other source for the nature description found in such lines perhaps we have the whole truth. This other source are the *natureingänge* and vivification found everywhere in the rude popular song which every age exhibits. Such decorative bits as did not come to school-poetry from a Vergil, a Prudentius, or a Fortunatus, may well have been supplied by the inexhaustible treasury of folk-verse.

[1] *Hildeberti et Marbodi Opera*, ed. Beaugendre (1708), p. 1617; Migne, *Patrologia*, Vol. CXVII, p. 1717; Trench, *op. cit.*, p. 49. Mr. G. L. Hendrickson translates the poem:

That I should be harsh and brutish the grace of the springtime forbids,
And the form of my soul I draw from the things about me.
To Nature's self for this I give thanks and praise, nor, I think, without reason:
For her flowers are gay with a thousand varied colors,
A grassy fleece over the earth she has drawn.
With leaves the grove is green and bursts with buds,
Garden plots are bright with the emerging rose.
Who such beauty can behold nor yet be moved nor glad,
Him shall nothing have power to stir, and in his heart is discord;
He who will not proclaim with praise the beauty of earth
Is churlish toward his maker, whose honor serves
The stern winter, summer, autumn, and the spring's loveliness.

Among much that is chaff one meets an occasional passage of true poetry which is perhaps the more moving for its very unexpectedness. We should be much the loser in omitting from our study of the mediaeval lyric the elegiac lines of Agius, which express his yearning for Hadumod,[1] the scene in Strabo's *Hortulus* where a mother fights off Death from her exhausted child, or the *Vision of Merchdeof*, written by the English monk Æthelwulf (Clarus lupus).[2] The environment of such passages is largely metrical and stilted. But who can say from the ninth century on just what line divides meter from rhythm? Are the ensuing rhymed hexameters or doggerel verses—no matter if they be measured six feet to the line:

Ordo monasticus ecclesiasticus esse solebat,
Dura cibaria cum per agrestia rura colebat.
Nulla pecunia nulla negotia praepediebant,
Quam capitalia quam venialia nostra piebant.[3]

More important surely for mediaeval philology than to sift and arrange poems carefully according to their meters is the task of calling attention to what is worth while in these verses;[4] to do away with the impression which often still prevails that the Latin of the Middle Ages separates ancient from modern times, much as the desert of Sahara lies between the Atlantic Ocean and the valley of the Nile.[5] And yet another reason why we may be per-

[1] *Poetae aevi Karolini*, Vol. III, ed. Traube, pp. 369 ff.; Taylor, *The Classical Heritage of the Middle Ages* (New York), 1903, p. 299.

[2] Cf. *Poetae aevi Karolini*, Vol. III, Part 2, p. 35; *ibid.*, Vol. I, pp. 582 ff.; Traube, *Karolingische Dichtungen* (1888), p. 8.

[3] For other examples of such rhymed hexameters cf. Wilhelm Meyer's "Radewins Theophilus und die Arten der gereimten Hexameter" (*Sitzungsber. d. Münchener Akad.* (1873), Vol. I. pp. 74 ff.), or now his *Gesammelte Abhandlungen zur mittellateinischen Rhythmik* (1905), Vol. I, pp. 84 ff.

[4] Winterfeld prefaced the *Stilfragen aus der lateinischen Dichtung des Mittelalters* with the statement: "Mediaeval philology would surrender the finest results it could possibly attain, it would be dead at its own hands, if it neglected to winnow out from the whole mass of literature that which is vital for us today, that which deserves to endure or to be awakened into new life. There is not overmuch of such material; but they are unlettered who refuse the claim of the Middle Ages to have produced individual compositions of the highest order —real national creations, even though they are written in the language of Rome."

[5] Hark while Budik speaks with trumpet voice: "Since the ages of Pericles and Augustus, whose perfect creations enjoy imperishable youth, until the middle of the fifteenth century, one sees nothing but a desert waste, the dreary and sterile monotony of which is broken only by some scattered brushwood, whose most vigorous productions awaken rather astonishment than admiration." Cf. *Leben und Wirken der vorzüglichsten lateinischen Dichter des xv-xviii. Jahrhunderts* (1828), p. 7.

mitted to divide the mass of mediaeval song into the three categories above suggested is that we desire in all simplicity to detach a certain group from the complete corpus in order to refer it to Germany (or to France, as the case may be). We may then speak of such a group as a national and native product, and not as a cosmopolitan and universal one; if, that is, we succeed in making evident that Germany had previous to its native *minnesang* a more or less popular tradition of Latin love-songs written by Germans then one source at least of the Swabian efflorescence is made clear. And Latin *minnelieder* become the utterance of German sentimentality, if we successfully fix their roots in Bavarian soil. Latin love-songs though they be, we may then regard them as lyrics written by Germans, the outgrowth of southern German life and social conditions, the expression of their immediate environment, just as truly and as nearly as all the tuneful poetry of Goethe is but the later budding of his Main-and-Rhein sojourn, a region where blood flows as lightly and merrily as wine.

THREE LYRIC TYPES: RELIGIOUS, SATIRICAL, EROTIC

The first sort of Latin lyric—the religious and didactic poem—existed continuously all through the early centuries and in the Middle Ages. The church hymn and the ode to some particular saint, devout inscriptions on portal and tomb, philosophizing distichs on the evils of this world and the glories of the next, admonitions to chastity and piety, elucidations of Old Testament story—these fairly distinguishable sorts of religious and didactic lyric are foreign to our present endeavor. It is not their Latin diction which obscures all trace of their place of origin—it is rather the dead level of their manner and tone, the unvarying theme of their discourse. Even when they do become elegiac or sentimental, or contain as often bits of nature-description[1] and lilting cadences,

[1] Prudentius, from whom scores of mediaeval hymnodists copied, is full of such nature-descriptions, beautiful in color and often worldly in tone. One may cull them from almost any page of his *Cathemerinon*. The following quatrain is typical of many:

Methinks in all her rustic bowers
The earth is spread with clustering flowers:
Odors of nard and nectar sweet
E'en o'er the sands of Syrtes fleet.

Did we not know the context we could easily confuse such places as this with the utterances of Ausonius in his *De rosis nascentibus*, or his *Mosella*, or with such stanzas as that in which

rising at times to really fervid and emotional utterance[1]—as a body of verse they still remain aside from the real world of life and living men, and their prototype is almost without exception the Bible and the older Latin literature, classical or patristic. Adam of St. Victor, with whom perhaps even Hildebert of Tours cannot dispute the palm of sacred Latin poetry, is a notable illustration of this. A perusal of his hymns will show them to be weighted with learned allusion[2] that rarely fuses into the passion of his verse, that gives no hint of the land of his birth or his adoption. The authors of many such pieces are known—such a one French, this one English, that one of Italy; but yet none should make bold to find localized description in them, they do not smell of the soil that bore them, they do not sing peculiar scenes. They either glow with a fervor single to the kingdom of God or shiver frostily in the chill gleams of professional religiosity and cant. They are generally but the frozen and inane emanation of a poetical rhetoric that was the serving-maid of theology, whether they spring from Aix or Orleans, from Paris or Padua.

There are, however, two related lyric forms which it costs something to lay aside. One is the secular ode modeled directly upon hymns to the Virgin; the other is the religious parody. According to the standards of today the first class is apt to be regarded as lecherous—but in certain cases it is impossible to decide whether we are confronted by mediaeval naïveté or by the most outspoken brutality. It is difficult for us to imagine a deliberate sensuality appearing in the cult of Mary-worship which the twelfth century carried to such extravagance,[3] and yet we may scarcely rid ourselves of suspicion. It is unnecessary to deal with this topic at

Symmachus sings the charms of Gaurus and Baja. Cf. Pope, *The Hymns of Prudentius* (London), 1904, pp. 25, 27, 39, 45, 47, 53, 91, 105, 128; Ampère, *Histoire littéraire de la France avant Charlemagne* (1867)[2], p. 268; Boissier, *La fin du paganisme* (1891), Vol. II, p. 213.

[1] I should not willingly be thought guilty in this connection of lightly dismissing the claims of mediaeval hymnody to that which in individual instances it attained: the greatest artistic beauty of lyric expression between the Silver Age and the Age of Renaissance. I am merely characterizing with a sole aim in view the great mass of religious and didactic utterance as we find it, say, in Dreves' *Analecta hymnica medii aevi*, in the *Poetae aevi Karolini*, and other encyclopedic collections.

[2] Cf. Gautier, *Œuvres poétiques d'Adam de St. Victor* (1881)[2]; Dreves, *Stimmen aus Maria-Laach*, Vol. XXIX, pp. 278, 416; Trench, *op. cit.*, pp. 55 ff.

[3] Cf. Gourmont, *Le latin mystique* (1892), p. 202; also Salzer, *Die Sinnbilder und Beiworte Mariens in der deutschen Literatur und lateinischen Hymnenpoesie des Mittelalters* (1890).

any length and so I will content myself with printing what may be regarded as an *urtypus* of this sort of thing and then dismiss the matter with a note.[1]

Ave, pulcra pelle, pulpa,
Foecundata sine culpa,
  Sine viri semine!
Ave, cujus pulcrimenti
Totus fulgor firmamenti
  Vincitur vibramine!

Ave, pulcra naso, malis,
Pulcra dorso, pulcra palis,
  Dentiumque serie!
Pulcra, pulcram aliorum
Formam vincis et olorum
  Olorina facie.

Luckily such travesties of sacred odes do not seem to contain the living spark. Compared with the long life which dwelt within other kinds of mediaeval lyric they had their ephemeral day and passed. Not so with the bacchic songs which parodied religious lyrics, such as:

Ave! Color vini clari;
Ave! Sapor sine pari;
Tua nos inebriari
  Digneris potentia!

[1] Personally I connect such songs with the longer descriptive pieces dealing with the mistress bit by bit, and believe that they both had their origin in monastic and clerical celibacy. Here, too, in my opinion, belong the paidika and pederastic poems. Such themes as the dissection of the weaker sex into a hundred anatomical parts and love-messages to boys we know were seized upon avidly by mediaeval poetasters and the resultant verses had a wide diffusion almost beyond that of any other type of song. In the course of casual reading in mediaeval poetry and prose I have been able to add some thirty titles to the bibliography of sodomy in the Middle Ages contained in Traube, *O Roma nobilis*, p. 308; Du Méril (1847), p. 102; Dümmler *Zeitschr. f. deut. Alt.*, Vol. XXII, p. 256; and Hertz, *Spielmannsbuch*[2], p. 375. And as to the other theme — the microscopical study of woman — there is literally no end to the number of its adherents. He who wishes to have his fill of such cataloguing at a single sitting may turn best perhaps to the narrative poem of 150 leonine distichs printed in Dümmler's *Anselm der Peripatetiker* (Halle), 1872, or to Gerald of Barri's *Descriptio cujusdam puellae* in 49 distichs (*Opera*, 1862, ed. Brewer, Vol. II).

Two matters of some importance we may gain from a study of this perversion of poetry: (1) If such voluptuousness be the result, as I imagine, of continence rather than of loose-living, then most of this unchaste verse need not be regarded as the work of ribald and blasphemous clerks whom learning had spoiled for the church, but rather as the tortured fancies bred in monkish cells — fancies that at times border (as Symonds suggests) upon delirium. (Cf. Hagen, *Carmina medii aevi* [1877], pp. 178 ff.); (2) Where no certain records of date exist, we do not need to deny an early mediaeval origin of such songs as the *Lydia bella candida puella*, merely because their intensity of passion appear to the impulsive critic to be "classical" or "modern."

Felix venter quem intrabis!
Felix lingua quam rigabis!
Felix os quod tu lavabis,
Et beata labia![1]

These drinking-songs had a long and sturdy, if little dignified, line of descendants. There are many reasons for such popularity: they were singable and simple ordinarily beyond their compeers which dealt with sexual love, and they were more natural. Sometimes they contain an honest note of protest, often a sparkling wit. As they get farther and farther from their original *Ave* model they often deserve inclusion among the best drinking-songs—and this is high praise—which the Middle Ages have given us. But for our purpose, which is to contrast popular Latin poetry with that of the school and church, they had best remain in the place to which their origin assigns them: with the religious ode which they caricature. For, whatever may be the animating motive of these stanzas, whether intentional parody or imitation of sacred verses as a matter of pure convenience, the result is the same. They are general and vague in tone, without distinctive appeal. No more cosmopolitan and threadbare expression can be imagined than that which clothes them. If we happen to suspect that a certain Frenchman, say, wrote one of them, it was as a clerk that he wrote, not as a Frenchman—and his model has been so closely followed or transcribed that no trace of authorship can be safely postulated.

Now in laying aside from the discussion the Latin religious lyric it must not be thought that I am prone to doubt the important influence which has been ascribed to it as a model for much of the profane lyric. But we do not need, on the basis of all our evidence, to believe that the mediaeval Latin song owed its very existence to either school or church. I may hope to have made at least acceptable in an earlier essay the doctrine that a German popular balladry ever existed; such poems were of course accentual in utterance, like similar *volkslieder* in neighboring France. And there is no need of our holding in the light of this knowledge that

[1] For a full treatment and bibliography of sacred parody in mediaeval and modern literature cf. Novati, *Studi critici e letterari* (Turin), 1889, pp. 179–310. The listing of a score of other titles which deal with this same subject in one phase or another would have no point here, as Novati's remarkable essay contains them all.

church hymns exercised a predominant influence in bringing about rhythmic verse when the latter was everywhere already.[1] There was as we know a profane poetry in the Middle Ages which imitated awkwardly but assiduously the metrical (quantitative) poems of classical authors. There was, too, a profane poetry which was much influenced by the church hymn and like it employed rhythmic (accentual) expressions. The former of these was ordinarily known as *versus*, the latter as *mod(ul)i*. Immense bodies of poetic writing represent the one or the other of these classes; and still there need be no fear in believing that one sort of erotic lyric—the kind which lent itself most readily to dance and song, to lightness and grace and swing—found its most perfect model in the vernacular measures which German and French already knew. This may seem a dogmatic statement and at first blush unwarranted by the facts. It is an assertion which should not be lightly made, but it may not with justice be lightly dismissed. I would but ask the reader's reservation of judgment until the facts are all displayed, and in order not to duplicate evidence would refer him once for all to what has been adduced in my previous article already referred to.

If we must exclude the first class of lyric, then, from our study of native and national song written in Latin—if the Religious and Didactic poem does not answer to the demands made upon a popular body of verse—let us now examine the other two sorts: the Satire, and the Ballads of Love, Spring, and Wine.

[1] Rather than attempt a statement of my own on this important point I believe it all-sufficient to quote the words of Gaston Paris (*Lettre à M. Léon Gautier sur la versification latine rhythmique*, 1866, p. 23): "Pour moi, je pense au contraire que la versification rhythmique est d'origine toute populaire, qu'elle n'a d'autre source qu'elle-même, qu'elle a existé de tout temps chez les Romains, qu'elle ne doit rien à la métrique, et qu'elle est avec elle précisément dans le même rapport que la langue populaire, le *sermo plebeius*, avec la langue littéraire de Rome. Toutes deux ont eu la même destinée: la langue lettrée et la versification métrique, mortes réellement avec l'empire, ont conservé chez les savants une vie artificielle qui dure encore; la langue populaire et la versification rhythmique ont continué a vivre, et se sont développées et ramifiées dans les langages et dans les poésies des nations romaines. La versification populaire notamment, méprisée et obscure au temps de la grandeur romaine, conservée à peine en quelques fragments par des écrivains amateurs d'anecdotes qui ont sacrifié la dignité à la curiosité, acquit avec le christianisme un domaine immense et une inspiration nouvelle, et produisit bientôt avec une richesse inouïe de quoi porter pendant dix siècles toute la poésie de plusieurs grands peuples: c'est véritablement le grain de sénevé de la parabole, vile semence, dédaigneusement jetée en terre, qui devient un arbre aux mille branches, verdoyant et touffu, sur lequel chantent les oiseaux du ciel."

Some claim has already been put forward for the mediaeval Latin satire as an essentially French thing. Giesebrecht long ago insisted upon northern France as the birthplace of the goliard and of goliardic poetry.[1] And he seems in a way to have won his point, despite the fact that his attempt to identify the archpoet (Golias) with Walter of Châtillon has failed,[2] and that the claims advanced for Germany and England (even for Italy)[3] have never been definitely quashed. But historians and critics of French literature still treat of Latin satire as a thing apart from the development of national spirit and vernacular progress.[4] Whereas, if we but substantiate their claim to French origin, Latin satires become in a trice the precipitate of Gallic wit. Does the investigator not thus yield to the temptation of regarding the problem which confronts him in the case of any text as a literary rather than a historical one, so that if he be confronted by a Latin satire, or by an oriental tale written in Latin, he is prone to consider them un-French matters, because their sources or their manner are cosmopolitan and extraneous, and not provincial? Would it not be more profitable to view any literary expression that grew hardily in mediaeval France from the background of mediaeval France itself?

For, suppose such forms as appear in France at this time, except for the indigenous *chansons de geste* and the *canso*, were transplanted from other climes; does this mean that we can afford to study them other than as the product of this age and this particular region? Must we not seek in them the idea of their French adapters rather than the original theme which they received from other and older civilizations? The palm tree and the olive which are such characteristic features of the northern Mediterranean land-line are demonstrably new adaptations. The whole plant growth of many

[1] *Allgemeine Monatsschrift* (1853), pp. 16 ff.

[2] Cf. Hauréau, *Not. et. Extr.*, Vol. XXIX, pt. 2, pp. 253 ff., and Meyer, *Göttinger Nachrichten*, p. 75.

[3] Cf. J. Grimm, and Wright, *opp. cit.*, and Burckhardt, *Die Kultur der Renaissance in Italien* (1869).

[4] So much so that it comes never to mention except perhaps in some single instance where an individual Latin poem offers the source of a French derivative. Cf. Lenient, *La satire en France au moyen age* (1893); Haessner, *Goliardendichtung u. Satire im xiii. Jhdt. in England* (1905); Langlois, *Revue bleue* (1892), p. 808.

a European landscape has quite changed within historic times. But do we therefore consider this vegetation a foreign thing? Is not any growth which takes root in a new soil and prospers for generations in sun and rain the very product of the new soil to which it has been transplanted? In final analysis is not practically everything a nation possesses borrowed at some time or other from an outland source, at least so far as external form is concerned? We have just termed the *chanson de geste* indigenous to France, but in last reduction is it French or is it German? And who shall ever solve the problem of what to denominate the oral tradition of the Merovingian epoch? Was it still German, all Latin, or a near-Latin known as Romanice?

Now I may not attempt to deal here further with the mediaeval satire as an essentially French development, for several reasons. First, I am at present little fitted for the task; second, if done at all, it must be made the subject of another occasion in order not to confuse the issue of the present one; and third, satirical poetry seems to me only lyric in that highest flight it takes when it ceases to deal with the stereotyped abuses of the Roman church and expresses the poet's personal feeling of injury or shame. So many twelfth- and thirteenth-century satirical poems are nothing more than mere objurgations of the inherent viciousness of woman, of dissuasion from sodomy and greed, of complaint of simony and niggardliness within the church, that the personal element so necessary to all lyric expression is lost.

It must, however, not be felt that these words constitute an evasion of the point before us. He who devotes sufficient study to the task will find that thirteenth-century English satire owes much in form and spirit to the Latin satire which thousands of young English students learned to know at the schools of northern France;[1] and, what is much more to the point, he will learn to distinguish sharply between Latin satires composed on the one hand by Frenchmen and on the other by Englishmen. Thus will an added distinguishing mark be gained for the temperament of

[1] I miss from the otherwise excellent chapter of Schofield on "Anglo-Latin Literature" a sufficient acknowledgment of this debt. Cf. *English Literature from the Norman Conquest to Chaucer* (1906), pp. 59 ff.

either nationality during the age in question. And this, I take it, is one of the highest rewards for which the comparative study of literature strives.

And now perhaps we should be ready to take up the third type of mediaeval Latin lyric, the twelfth-century Ballads of Love, Spring, and Wine, and show how a double tradition maintained within this class: one that of the school and of learning, the other altogether popular in tone and as simple as any of the tuneful Romantic songs of thirteenth- or nineteenth-century Germany. But before we come to this final chapter there is still pioneer work to be done. Because there exists no adequate history of mediaeval poetry it is not generally known that before the twelfth century Latin lyrical poetry shows the same types as later. This we shall therefore demonstrate before dealing with the lyrical type of special interest to us.

LATIN LYRICAL POETRY PREVIOUS TO THE TWELFTH CENTURY

We have seen thus far that there is a tendency to assign to the protean mime the lyric material previous to the end of the eleventh century, in so far as it was not the work of clerics;[1] and from then forward to bespeak the same material for the goliard. Now the first of these appellations has been shown to be but a generic term for "entertainer," and the same fact is true of the latter word. If we examine the records of twelfth, thirteenth, and fourteenth centuries we find *goliardi* closely adjoined to and synonymous with *ribaldi*, *bufones*, *leccatores*, *joculatores*, *trutanni*, *vagi scholares*, *parasiti*, *histriones*, *pauperes*, *enchanteors*, *menestrieux*, and the like. "Goliard" like "villein" has become a

[1] Gröber (*Grundriss*, Vol. II, Part 1, p. 180) would surrender practically all this early material to the cleric. Of the poetry during the ninth and tenth centuries he says: "Profane sentiment and sympathy with earthly pleasures, the prerequisites of a secular lyric, were so reckoned a shame by the cleric who alone (!) could use the Latin language, that he dared not find expression for them in poetry. Impenetrable to earthly joy and sorrow alike, he was prone to struggle against worldly impulses, and only referred to them in his writing to warn against them or to implore divine aid in their subduing. And when the cleric does allude to worldly themes he so conquers them, so tones them down, that his personal dignity does not suffer in the least. Very little documented verse of this time (A. D. 800–1000) oversteps such limitations."

wide term of derogation and reproach[1] and little is therefore to be gained by associating the name with a great mass of mediaeval Latin poetry which deals in every possible way with almost everything under heaven from the tenth to the fifteenth century.

I believe it would add everywhere to clarity of discussion, if the term "goliardic poetry" was retained for erotic and satirical Latin verses written by school poets from the rise of learning in the twelfth century down to say the Italian Renaissance; this would allow us to speak of a "popular Latin poetry" when referring during the same period to erotic and singable Latin lyrics which are free from the quibbles and formulae of the more mechanical and cultured poetry. Before the twelfth century the popular sort of Latin verse may be referred to a "minstrelsy," the remainder of it which is evidently the labor of school bench and monkish cell may be denominated "clerical" or "school" poetry. If we wish, we may of course substitute the mime for the minstrel when we speak of popularizing verse before 1100, but this would appear undesirable because of the false implications of the word suggested above. It is at least necessary that we possess concise terms with which to designate the opposing sorts of verse of which we are now come to speak, to avoid the confusion which arises from the consideration of them as one indissoluble entity.

First, let us pass in review what there was in Latin poetry before the twelfth century that furnished models for the verses of the goliards. Such a list is not elsewhere accessible, and I may therefore be forgiven for entering upon the subject at greater length than would otherwise be necessary. The result of this examination will show that for two centuries before Abelard, St. Bernard, and Walter of Châtillon there existed in France and Germany Latin lyrics and ballads pliant in meter, ready in rhyme,

[1] Cf. the suggestive declension of this word written down by some surly mediaeval scholar (Novati, *Carmina medii aevi*, 1883, p. 28):

Singulariter		*et Pluraliter*
Nom.	hic villanus	hi maledicti
Gen.	hujus rustici	horum tristium
Dat.	huic tferfero	his mendacibus
Acc.	hunc furem	hos nequissimos
Voc.	o latro	o pessimi
Abl.	ab hoc depredatore	ab his infidelibus

sure in diction, emotional in nature; requiring but the life-giving breath and the enlarging mold of a cosmopolitan and awakened age to make of them the graceful poetry of the mediaeval Latin students.

I may not speak for another, but I believe the first sensation which comes from reading in the volumes of *Poetae aevi Karolini* is one of frank disappointment. It is a little perhaps as if one's hand had reached out half unconsciously for a book of poems and picked up a table of logarithms instead. We feel as though it must have been a sorry kind of poetry which devoted itself so largely to epitaphs, inscriptions on church gates, riddles, acrostics, book titles, and the like. The whole is at first blush about as lively as a collection of burial urns.[1] And there are unfortunately many who close the covers of these volumes never to return to them.

If we are patient, however, and continue in our search through the broad acre of measured lines, we begin to gain insight into matters which interest us. As we grow accustomed to the absence of rhyme, to the dearth of theme, to the stilted manner which is characteristic of even the best of this poetry, what with its constant borrowing from classical imagery and its hollow reminiscence of biblical phrasing, we become conscious that while real beauty and earnestness is ever lacking, while the deep issues of life are never touched, there is yet before us a body of adequate diction, a certain level dignity, a smooth, if shallow, surface of expression. How great a step in advance is marked by these things he alone knows who has labored, let us say, with the phrases of the French grammarian Virgilius Maro, with the befuddled *Hisperica famina*,[2] or—truth to tell—with the Merovingian bar-

[1] It is perhaps much to be regretted that we have not fuller remains of the Latin poetry written by Irishmen during the sixth and seventh centuries. We know that there reigned in the schools of Ireland at this period not alone among her professed scholars but among the plain missionaries as well a classical spirit, a love of literature for its own sake, and a keen delight in poetry. Cf. Hauréau's chapter on the "Écoles d'Irlande" in his *Singularités historiques et littéraires* (1861), and Poole, *Illustrations of the History of Mediaeval Thought* (1884), p. 12. For a complete but brief survey of the Irish missions, cf, Haddan's "Scots on the Continent" (*Remains*, Oxford, 1876, pp. 258-94). Cf. also Roger, *L'enseignement des lettres classiques d'Ausone à Alcuin* (1905), pp. 202-73; Sandys, *A History of Classical Scholarship* (1903), pp. 421 ff.

[2] For the latest and best treatment of these two, with full bibliography, cf. Roger, *L'enseignement des lettres classiques*, pp. 110 ff., 283 ff.

barisms of Gregory of Tours. In fact the voluble euphuism of Venantius Fortunatus, much as the Carolingian poets owed to it, offers not the sure foundation for coming lyricality that the broad, thin lines of ninth-century canting do.[1] To quote almost at random from the better-known material of this time, here are the opening words of the *Epitaphium Chlodarii pueri regis:*

Hoc satus in viridi servatur flosculus arvo,
Pulchrior en lacte candidiorque nive,
Donec altipotens veniat per saecula judex,
Qui metet ostrifluas falce perenne rosas.
Hunc tua, Jordanis, sacrata protulit unda,
Pampinus Engadi rore beavit eum.
Livida purpureis vaccinia cincta rosetis
Vernat ut et rosola gliscit in omne decus,
Pallida ceu sandix inter viburna refulgit,
Et nitit imbrifluus Cynthius altus aquis,
Ut rubit obriza flagranti cocta camino,
Et rutilat vario Indus honore lapis.[2]

After a little we begin to meet with nature-introductions, or a few lines on outdoor nature tucked away here and there in longer narrative pieces, and occasionally even with whole songs (if one may call them so) devoted to pastoral scenes. Stiff they are still, even the *De cuculo* attributed to Alcuin, and the *Carmen philomelaicum* of Paulus Albarus, and the *Ecloga* of Naso, but they stir the sense with pleasant anticipation of what is to come when poetry shall leave the apron-strings of doctrinal theology and come to wander through the earth alone.

Lumine candoris clarent hic lilia celi,
Fulbe rose florens imitant his purpura terre
Et viole pariter stellarum vice coruscant.
Dum vario redolent pariter unite colore,
Albeole renitent ceu unio lilia conclis,
Instar et gipsae conplectens colla puelle
Lactea. . . . .

[1] Winterfeld would have brushed this statement impatiently aside. "Mimes everywhere," he declares. "One citation more or less makes blessed little (*blutwenig*) difference. The Merovingian time was better than its reputation. It has in the poems of its mimes works to offer us that contain more poetic strength than the whole erudite Round Table of Charles the Great could achieve" (*op. cit.*, pp. 74 and 57). I am willing to be convinced of this, but not until the "poems of its mimes" are reconstructed in a way that will make comparison with Carolingian hexameters possible.

[2] *Pauli et Petri carmina dubia*, no. 39.

Work such as this may be *meistergesang*, but it cannot be denied that there is excellence indwelling in it. The time was not yet ripe perhaps for what the next century or two were to bring: a real renaissance of conscious poetry written by men who were alive to their finger tips. And yet when the new springtime came, it was, so far as we may tell, only the late fruition of forces at work during the previous generations, for swelling lines such as the opening verses of the *Planctus Karoli* tell of what is coming:

A solis ortu usque ad occidua
Littora maris planctus pulsat pectora.
Heu mihi misero!

This was composed not later than the year 815 and some thirty years thereafter Gottschalk could swing into verse like that to a boy:

O quid jubes, pusiole?
Quare mandas, filiole,
Carmen dulce me cantare,
Cum sim longe exul valde,
Intra mare?
O cur jubes canere?

Such hints as these show an occasional tendency to depart from the conventional mold of classicality, but they weigh little when compared with the great mass of Merovingian and Carolingian poetry, where elegies, encomia, epithalamia, ballads of battle,[1]

[1] Winterfeld creates a false impression in translating these into the *Nibelungen*-quatrain and in adopting also the phrases of the *Bänkelsänger;* we have but to compare his verses with the original, to see how he reads in what does not exist:

Omnes gentes qui fecisti, tu Christe, dei sobules,
Terras, fontes, rivos, montes et formasti hominem,
Avaresque convertisti ultimis temporibus.

Thus begins the story of Pippin's victory over the Avari, and not as we should believe from Winterfeld:

Christe, du Sohn Gottes, der du die Völker all'
Erschaffen und Land und Quellen, Bach und Berge zumal,
Der du nach deinem Bilde den Menschen hast gemacht,
Du hast in der letzten Frist auch die Hunnen heimgebracht.

Likewise in the ballad of Fontenoy:

Aurora cum primo mane tetram noctem dividens,
Sabbatum non illud fuit, sed Saturni dolium;
De fraterna rupta pace gaudet daemon impius,

we discover but slight indication of the following:

Des Frührots erster Strahl das Dunkel der Nacht zerriss;
Da wurde Macht gegeben dem Fürsten der Finsternis,
Kein Sabbat war's, der graute: gebrochen der Brüder Bund,
Mit wildem Hohngelächter frohlockte der Hölle Schlund.

Much depends on the translator's whim in such matters; if he translates in the manner of *Genesis*, the result reminds of *Genesis*, if he adopt Horatian diction we are reminded of

and even invitations to love and to wine are complacently measured off at about two ells to the line.

And yet, if there were no further evidence at hand of the Merovingian and Carolingian poetry than what is to be found in the volumes of the *Poetae aevi Karolini*[1] we could still be prepared for an efflorescence of lyrical poetry some two or three centuries later. For, if we but remove the theological allusions of the earlier poems and substitute for them the color and joy of life which the new humanism brought in its wake; if we but exchange for copied hexameters a cadenced swing and rhyme, lyrical pieces are won for us. Majesty, smoothness, and the full vocabulary of poetic diction were already at hand for mediaeval Latin students and poets, and they made good use of their opportunity.

But, happily, another sort of poem was handed down to the goliards—songs from a minstrelsy as brimful of verve and lightness as any to which they attained. Samples (all too few!) of this sort of thing have come down to us. There is the atrabilious correspondence between two Merovingian bishops, Importunus of Paris and Chrodebert of Tours (*ca.* A. D. 665), written in a rhythmic prose that is curiously effective: five letters in all, of which the following may yield an illustration:

> Nay, as true as you're a goat,
> A deal too far you're going;
> The measure as it is

Horace; and naturally if he introduce the terms of mediaeval minstrelsy, we are ready to swear the thing was written by a mime. But after Winterfeld is done and finished, the originals are what they were before he ever began: awkward long lines after the fashion of their time.

[1] It is a shock to learn that we may be called upon to sacrifice the priceless reference to love-songs contained in the Carolingian capitulary of 789 (cf. Boretius, *Capit. reg. Franc.*, I, 63: "et nullatenus ibi *winileodos* scribere vel mittere praesumant: et de pallore earum propter sanguinis minuationem"). Till now this passage has been generally believed to forbid certain nuns to write love-songs and to achieve an interesting but dangerous pallor. Some critics, it is true, insisted on interpreting *winileodos* as songs of joy and acclaim, or even as choral songs of labor (Uhl, *Zeitschr. f. deut. Phil.*, Vol. XXXVIII [1906], p. 123), but most of us felt constrained to regard them as erotic verses because of the context in which we found them.

Recently, however, Jostes has translated the Latin phrase above-quoted: "And under no consideration shall they make bold to enlist or dispatch *constables* (Schutzmannen), not even because of their fear: (this we decree) that bloodshed may be lessened." Cf. *Zeitschr. f. deut. Alt.*, Vol. XLIX (1907), p. 310. While it cannot be said that Jostes effectually establishes his point, he supports it with good evidence, and thereby furnishes renewed testimony to the difficulty of definitely gaining the sense of Merovingian Latin.

Runs full to overflowing.
You need emasculation—
I'm frank enough to tell—
To keep the living soul of you
From roasting down in hell.
Ah, at the day of Judgment
You will be in evil case!
For lechers are afraid to look
Upon God's holy face.[1]

And we have the hint of a mocking distich or song in the quip of an eighth-century minstrel related to us by the Monk of St. Gall (*de rebus gestis Karoli magni* I, 13; *Monumenta Germaniae historica; Scriptores*, Vol. II, p. 736): *Nunc habet Uodalricus honores perditos in oriente et occidente, defuncta sua sorore!*

Less than a century later we learn of how a song made mock of Hug timidus: *qui erat timidus super omnes homines. Sic enim cecinerunt ei domestici sui, ut aliquando pedem foris sepe ponere ausus non fuisset.* This poor count is historically documented, having died (of fright?) at Tours in the year 837.[2]

Of milder tone, but bubbling with cynical humor, are the tales of the abbot of Anjou, and of the hermit who wished to be an angel.

In Angers, it is said, there dwells a priest;
The name he bears is that of Father Adam.
There's no Angevin man among them all

[1] A translation offered only after much hesitation, because of difficulty in approximating the tone of the original:

Bonus nunquam eris,
Dum tale via tenes.
Per tua cauta longa,
Satis est vel non est?
Per omnia jube te castrare,
Ut non peccas per talis,
Quia fornicatoris Deus iudicabit, etc.

Cf. de Rozières, *Recueil général des formules usitées dans l'empire des Francs avant le x. siècle;* Boucherie, *Cinq formules rhythmées* (1867), p. 26; *Revue critique* (1867), p. 344; Zeumer, *Formulae Merovingici et Karolini aevi* (1886), p. 220; Gröber, *Grundriss*, Vol. II, p. 453; *Herrigs Archiv*, Vol. CXIV (1905), pp. 60 f.; Winterfeld, "Die Dichterschule St. Gallens," *Ilbergs Neue Jahrb.*, Vol. V, p. 358.

[2] Cf. Lachmann, *Kleinere Schriften*, Vol. I, p. 453; *Pauls Grundriss*, Vol. II², p. 69; Kögel, *Gesch. d. deut. Lit.*, Vol. I, Part 1, pp. 55–77. And did not Notker Labeo cry out: *In me psallebant qui bibebant vinum?* Other mocking songs of this time are mentioned in *Modern Philology*, Vol. III, p. 437.

With half his kidney, when it comes to bibbing.
Hurrah, hurrah! The praise we sing,
The praise we sing of Bacchus.[1]

So drank a churchman in the age of Charles the Great—and the swing of the song reminds us of a later *kommerslied* which celebrates the stout-hearted tippling of Johannes de Foucris:

Propter nimium Est Est
Dominus meus mortuus est.

And at the close of the tenth century a French minstrel immortalized a little monk in a ditty:

A monk named John, of stature small,
But in the virtues straight and tall,
Thus to the older brother spoke,
Who dwelt with him mid hermit-folk:[2]

"I fain would live like those above,"
He said, "secure in Heaven's love
No raiment wear, nor viands take,
Such as the hands of men do make."

But alack! The grass of the fields was but an ill lining for his paunch, and the frost was not tempered for his nakedness; so came it that he repented him of his desire, ran straightway home, and was content ever afterward to be but a good little hermit.

Another type of song, however, than the humorous and rollicking ballad, or the mournful plaint (like the *verna feminae suspiria*), we find at the very end of the tenth or the beginning of the eleventh century in the spring song: short invocations to the

[1] Cf. Dümmler, *Zeitschr. f. deut. Alt.*, Vol. XXIII, pp. 262, 265; Winterfeld, *Herrigs Archiv*, Vol. CXIV (1905), pp. 58 f.

Andecavis abas esse dicitur,
Ille nomen primum tenet hominum;
Hunc fatentur vinum vellet bibere
Super omnes Andechavis homines.
Eia, eia, eia laudes,
Eia laudes dicamus Libero.

[2] Cf. Jaffé, *Zeitschr. f. deut. Alt.*, Vol. XIV, p. 469; Piper, *Deut. Nat.-Lit.*, Vol. CCXXI, pp. 232 f.; Winterfeld, *Stilfragen*, p. 21:

Johannes abba, parvulus
Statura, non virtutibus,
Ita majori socio,
Quicum erat in heremo:

Volo, dicebat, vivere
Secure sicut angelus,
Nec veste, nec cibo frui,
Qui laboretur manibus.

warmth and beauty of it, generally without parallelism. Such are the songs published by Werner,[1] one of which will suffice:

Hyemale
Tempus vale,
Aestas redit cum laeticia
Cum calore,
Cum decore
Quae aestatis sunt indicia.

Terra floret
Sicut solet,
Revirescunt lilia;
Rosae flores
Dant odores,
Canunt alatilia.

Slight in structure, commonplace enough in idea, if you will; and yet as simple in the presentation of its theme as any German folk-song may be. Hushed are the flowing nature-descriptions borrowed from Vergil, softened are the too vivid colors of Prudentius; there remains the slender, almost lean, grace that we associate with earliest German *minnesang*.

And still let us pause to consider two other types of song, for this is necessary if we will give an adequate idea of the complexity of form existant in the Latin lyric before the twelfth century. One is the earliest known *tagelied* or *aube* from the early tenth century: a song of three stanzas in Latin with a Provençal refrain. What scope for speculation does this not offer! It has been determined by critics to be of a decidedly clerical character, though why I know not, save for a chance resemblance of part of one line to a phrase in Ambrose's *Morning Hymn*. Even if the reader after viewing the poem believe it to be ecclesiastic in cast, what matters it? The refrain is undoubtedly taken from popular song, and it is as reasonable to believe the rest a clerical verse modeled on a pre-existent vernacular model,[2] as to think the type of *aube*, or lovers' waking-song, so widely disseminated in mediaeval Europe to have grown from a monkish root.[3]

[1] Cf. *Germania*, Vol. XXXVII (1892), p. 230. Traube called attention to the prior publication of *De terrae gremio* in the *Bibl. de l' École des Chartes*, Vol. XLVII, p. 89, and hinted the like in the case of *Hyemale tempus vale* (cf. *Vollmöllers Jahresbericht*, Vol. III [1895], p. 9). I have been as yet unable to verify the latter statement.

[2] Cf. De Gruyter *Das deutsche Tagelied* (1887), pp. 127 ff.; Schläger, *Studien über das Tagelied* (1895); R. M. Meyer posits a double basis for the *tagelied*, clerical and popular, without assigning priority to either, *Zeitschr. f. deut. Alt.*, Vol. XLIX (1907), p. 386.

[3] Cf. Julian Schmidt, *Zeitschr. f. deut. Phil.*, Vol. XII, pp. 333 ff.; Laistner, *Germania*, Vol. XXVI, pp. 415 ff; Ebert, *Gesch. d. Lit. d. Mittelalters im Abendlande*, Vol. III, pp. 182 f.; Gröber, *Grundriss*, Vol. II, p. 181; Rajna, *Studi di filologia romanza*, Vol. II, p. 97; Monaci, *Rendiconti dell 'Accademia dei Lincei, Cl. di scienze*, 5th ser., Vol. I, pp. 475, 785; *Zeitschr. f. roman. Phil.*, Vol. IX, p. 407; Jeanroy, *Origines*, p. 73.

While Phoebus' clear radiance is not yet arisen,
The dawn brings soft light to the lands;
The watchman calls to the slothful: Awake!
Day is approaching across the moist sea;
As it is lifted higher and draws near,
Straightway the shadows flee.[1]

Lo, the legions of the enemy burn
To overtake the unwary and the slumbering!
The herald warns them and bids them arise!
Day is approaching, etc.

From Arcturus departs the north-wind,
The stars of the sky hide their radiance,
The great bear stretches toward the east.
Day is approaching, etc.

Whatever this very song may be, it still shows the existence at about the year 900 of what we should otherwise not know to exist for another century or two: popular songs having to do with the waking of lovers from their slumbering danger.

And still, but for the exigency of our space, we are not nearly through with the listing of profane Latin lyrical remnants which attest the presence before the twelfth century of musical and tender poems and songs in France and Germany. But I may now perhaps believe my purpose fulfilled and leave further discussion on this point to another opportunity,[2] except for one poem.

[1] The Provençal refrain is

L'alba part umet mar atras;
Sol poi i pas,
Ab egal n'irant las tenebras;

or, as Jeanroy suggests,

L'albæ par umet mar atra sol
Poy pas abigil miraclar tenebras.

Monaci believes the refrain not Provençal but Ladin, and the poem composed in Upper Tyrol.

[2] I would again refer the reader to the article on the origins of *minnesang*, which contains many hints I have not repeated. At the end of the first millennium of our era we meet with a Latin poetry that answers adequately every need of story-telling and narrative, jest and farce, anecdote and fairy-tale, animal fable, political satire and ironic depiction, heroic legend and hagiography. The mere citation of such titles as the *Lombard Minstrel*, the *Minstrel's Reward*, the *Daughter of Desiderius*, *Adalgis*, the *Iron Charles*, recalls to us historical songs of presumably high merit; and such remembered poems as *Modus florum*, *Modus Liebinc*, *Lantfrid et Cobbo*, *Alfrad*, *Heriger*, the *Daughter of Proterius*, *Unibos*, etc., sufficiently inform us that Scherer and Kögel are right in demanding for this time a high development in poetical ability. I would by no means reason that these were in any narrow sense based upon lyric song—for they are without exception ballads, satirical narratives, and jesting tales. But I would return to the query of Müllenhoff printed above and ask: If we

A last contribution from our stock will be the song to a runaway boy by a tenth-century Veronese schoolmaster. I wish to present an English rendering of it—based upon the restoration of Traube[1]—because such a one has not yet been published, so far as I know, and there are certain difficulties in translation. It is the first mediaeval example of any worth of the pederastic verse so popular in the Middle Ages:

O admirable image of Venus,[2]
Whose body is all without blemish,
That god protect thee, who stars and sky
Created, who founded sea and earth.
Not through the wile of the thief[3] shalt thou suffer treachery;
May Clotho love thee, who spins out the thread.

Preserve the boy, I pray not in jest
To Lachesis, but with my whole heart,
To the sister of Atropos, lest she abandon thee.
May'st thou have as guides Neptune and Thetis

have examples galore of such art, how then should wide expression for the mightiest and most poetic impulse of all—the erotic lyric—have failed?

And before we close our search for idyllic and tender passages of a lyric sort we must needs hunt through the *Ruodlieb*, the *Waltharilied*, and longer narrative poems, to excerpt here and there verses that answer our every purpose in this matter. Besides which, sacred poetry and hymns would be made to yield their quota, for the most superficial search among the many volumes of the *Analecta hymnica* reveals how rich and suggestive some of this material is in the light that it throws by analogy, and at times directly, upon the profane Latin lyric.

[1] Cf. *O Roma nobilis* (1891), p. 11. This poem is introduced because it marks a distinctive type and will be referred to in a succeeding chapter. There are two methods employed by investigators of the mediaeval Latin poetry that offends modern convention. One is that of Wattenbach, which publishes everything it discovers to be of value; the other is that of Hauréau, which balks at making known uncomfortable material. Of the two methods the former is alone tenable if research is to be helpfully carried on.

[2] O admirabile Veneris idolum,
Cujus materiae nihil est frivolum,
Archos te protegat, qui stellas et polum
Fecit et maria condidit et solum.
Furis ingenio non sentias dolum;
Clotho te diligat, quae bajulat colum.

Salvato puerum non per hypothesim:
Sed firmo pectore deprecor Lachesim,
Sororem Atropos, ne curet haeresim.
Neptunum comitem habeas et Thetim,
Cum vectus fueris per flumen Athesim
Quo fugis amabo, cum te dilexerim?
Miser quid faciam, cum te non viderim?

Dura materies ex matris ossibus
Creavit homines jactis lapidibus.
Ex quibus unus est iste puerulus,
Qui lacrimabiles non curat gemitus.
Cum tristis fuero, gaudebit aemulus:
Ut cerva rugio, cum fugit hinnulus.

[3] I. e., Death.

When thou farest across the river Adige.
Why dost thou flee, pray, when I love thee?
Unhappy, what shall I do when I see thee not?

Hard material from the mother's bones
Created men, when the stones were thrown.[1]
And from one of those stones must that boy spring
Who is not troubled by tearful complainings.
When I am sad my rival will rejoice.
I cry out like the hind whose young flee from her.

THE MINSTREL AND THE LYRICAL BALLAD

The tedium of the preceding chapter may now be justified, for it has yielded us at least four distinct categories of Latin lyrical poetry before the twelfth century.

1. *Antique meters* definitely modeled on classical Latin forms. Such is a large part of the material which Dümmler, Traube, and Winterfeld have presented to us in the *Poetae aevi Karolini.* These meters continued from the time of the Carolingian revival down through the thirteenth century and frequently as they violate prosodic rules, much as they introduce themes foreign to classical traditions, their original source is evident: the poets of the Augustan age and of Silver Latinity. These lines often remind more of Strawberry Hill than they do of Rome—*leonini, caudati, unisoni*—but they come to express with strange adequacy many sides of the mediaeval spirit: joyous and tearful, cynical and maudlin. The archpoet begs for dinner and a coat in hexameters, and Hugo of Orleans turns them to his hand in the trilogy that depicts the faithlessness of the courtesan Flora.[2]

2. *Liturgical poems* invented for the service of the church. These rhyming structures were "voluminous systems of recurrent double rhymes, intricate rhythms molded upon tunes for chanting, solid melodic fabrics."[3] Dreves has made this material conveniently accessible in many of the volumes of the *Analecta hymnica medii aevi.* Such poems were soon adapted to profaner use by minstrel and goliard and a surprising lightness sometimes characterizes

[1] Refers to the Greek deluge-legend of Deucalion and Pyrrha.

[2] Cf. *Oxforder Gedichte des Primas,* Nos. vi, vii, viii.

[3] Cf. Symonds, *Wine, Women, and Song* (1884), p. 18; Saintsbury, *The Flourishing of Romance* (1897), p. 6.

jocose narrative ballads and spirited lyrics which are evidently clothed in this originally ecclesiastical form. But, after all, satire and parody were the chief gainers thereby. The rather ponderous movement of these church rhythms lent effectiveness and weight to the former, and inimitable background to the latter.

3. *Lyric survivals.*—Occasionally songs "whispering of pagan gods in exile, encouraging men to accept their life with genial enjoyment" meet our gaze during the early mediaeval period. Such verse are the *Jam, dulcis amica, venito* and the *O admirabile Veneris idolum:* these are the vicarious offspring of individual learning, bear on them frequently the hallmark of no particular age,[1] and have no breath of popular poetry within them. We are not surprised to find them in Octavian's *anthologia Latina* or among the Cambridge songs—pieces of similiar import and like beauty must have been contemporary with the *pervigilium Veneris* and must have continued the classical tradition down into the fifteenth century. This tradition was tenacious of life and presumably never quite interrupted in any century, particularly in Italy, for Rome continued to be felt the head of the world (*caput mundi*)[2] throughout the Middle Ages. A curious illustration of how widespread the remains of ancient knowledge were occurs in a poem of the popular sort sung on the walls of Modena in the first half of the ninth century by the soldiers of the watch:

O tu, qui servas armis ista moenia,
Noli dormire, moneo, sed vigila:
Dum Haector vigil extitit in Troja,
Non eam cepit fraudulenta Gretia.
Prima quiete dormiente Troja
Laxavit Synon fallax claustra perfida. . . . .

[1] It is interesting in such connection to follow the discussion of the dates of *Lydia bella* and *O admirabile* from the year 1829, when Naeke first discovered the former, to 1891, when Traube with seeming finality settled the age of the latter. Niebuhr, Gregorovius, Ozanam, Daniel, Riese, Baini, and Brambach arrived at widely diversified conclusions because of the apparent absence in this poem of any specific allusion. Cf. Traube, *O Roma nobilis* (1891), pp. 3 ff.

[2] Cf. Gregorovius, *Geschichte der Stadt Rom im Mittelalter;* Graf, *Roma nella memoria del medio evo* (1882); Traube, *O Roma nobilis;* Salvioli, *L'istruzione pubblica in Italia nei secoli viii, ix e x* (1879); Dresdner, *Kultur- und Sittengeschichte der italienischen Geistlichkeit im x. und xi. Jahrhundert* (1890), etc.

4. *Popularizing Latin lyrics.*—We have already noted how an eighth century minstrel sang his mocking rhyme;

> Nû habêt Uodalrîh
> firloran êrôno gilîh,
> ôstar enti uuestar,
> sîd irstarp sîn suester.

This tells us again what we already know so well from a multiplicity of records:[1] that jesters and minstrels were making verses for the willing ears of courtiers and churchmen like Angilbert at the very moment that serious-minded churchmen and school-poets were engaged in polishing their hexameters. Such testimony, together with stray *kommerslieder* and ballads from ninth, tenth, and eleventh centuries, should suffice to inform us that at this season the buds of earthly lyric were bursting into bloom; inform us that the tenth century was not exactly "the age of gloom, the age of iron, the age of lead," when the human intellect in Europe reached its nadir.[2] This time did open inauspiciously with great political disturbances and social readjustments; it ended in a sort of general panic because all the pursuits of life were stopped in apprehension of the judgment day. But we may no more read of this in our lyric records than we may suspect the cataclysm of the western empire from the gentle euphuism of Sidonius,[3] whose great complaint was that he "could not achieve six-foot lines when seven-foot barbarians were about him."

But there is another sort of popularizing Latin lyric suggested by the *Hyemale tempus vale* and the *Equitabat Bovo per silvam frondosam:* simplest songs of spring and dancing, maying and mating couplets. By no known process of alchemy can we distil these from any of the first three categories of Latin lyric above mentioned; their source is in *volkslied* quatrains, such as have been proved to exist long before earliest *minnesang.*[4] German dance-songs and choral singing must have ever existed in connec-

[1] Cf. the collocation in Reich, *Der Mimus*, Vol. I (1903), Pt. 2, pp. 743 ff.

[2] *Saeculum ferreum, plumbeum, obscurum:* Sandys, *A History of Classical Scholarship* (1903), p. 483.

[3] Cf. Dill, *Roman Society in the Last Century of the Christian Empire* (1899) [2], p. 190.

[4] Cf. R. M. Meyer, *Zeitschr. f. deut. Alt.*, Vol. XXIX, pp. 174 ff.

tion with the games and festivals of May.[1] Examples of such songs we find in the *Carmina burana:*

Swaz hie gat umbe
Daz sint allez megede,
Die wellent an man
Alle disen sumer gan. no. 129a;

Springewir den reigen
Nu, vrowe min,
Vröun uns gegen den meigen,
Uns chumet sin schin. no. 100a;

Chume, chume geselle min,
Ich enbite harte din,
Suzer roservarwer munt,
Chum un mache mich gesunt. no. 136a.

And such traditional verses now and then shine through the Latin lyrics which we find in the same collection:

Et sub tilia
Ad choreas venereas
Salit mater, inter eas
Sua filia. no. 114;

Late pandit tilia
Frondes, ramos, folia,
Thymus est sub ea
Viridi cum gramine,
In quo fit chorea. no. 108;

Stetit puella rufa tunica;
Siquis eam tetigit,
Tunica crepuit. Eia! no. 138;

Veni, veni, venias,
Ne me mori facias;
Hyrca, hyrce, nazaza,
Trillirivos! no. 136.

Crepuscular stirrings are these songs of Latin lyrics and love-ballads which were in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries to

[1] It is in these May fêtes that Gaston Paris would have us seek the origin of much of mediaeval lyric poetry; *Journal des Savants* (1892), p. 427. This theory is partially developed in Cesareo, *Le origini della poesia lirica in Italia* (1899), and given full credence by Santangelo (*op. cit.*, pp. 43 ff.) after a careful examination of the spring songs of the *Carmina burana.* But surely we do not need to connect these festivals with those of pagan antiquity held in honor of Venus, as Santangelo suggests our doing.

develop a hardier and more complex growth. The minstrel, as early as the eleventh century, and probably long before that, had gone for some of his most effective material where Goethe and the Romanticists went in a later age, to the inexhaustible well of popular song, there to draw new lyrics of his own. When and where this folkpoetry became first *courfähig* we do not know. The character of the audience the minstrel sang his songs to can only be surmised; like the peasant verses of Neidhart, they may have joyed the lowest or the highest in rank, and it is not yet safe to more than hazard a guess. But one thing is sure: side by side with antique meters and liturgical poems, in no sense derived from these or from certain other lyrical pieces which continued classical lyric traditions, there was for long before the twelfth century a popularizing and lyric Latin *spielmannspoesie* which mirrored the simpler sort of German popular poetry and derived much of its strength and beauty from it.

And because of this long preamble we may now proceed with an easier conscience—if not with a lighter heart—to the second part of our study. This will attempt a differentiation between, on the one hand, highly artificial and, as it were, professional goliard songs and, on the other hand, real Latin *minnesang*.

It may be that some, even much, of the foregoing article might have been omitted on the assumption that it repeated certain things already sufficiently known. But where the material is so vast as that of early mediaeval Latin poetry, where doctors (of philosophy) so carefully disagree as to all the main symptoms of it, where the vehicle in which many of the songs are written still unhappily remains so difficult a thing for us to read; I have been afraid not to go deeper into the foundations than I should have otherwise thought of doing. It is just because "erudition" has hitherto played so large a part in the criticism of mediaeval songs, because the layman has not more easily commanded them, that misunderstandings regarding their nature and their scope have been so long current.

PHILIP SCHUYLER ALLEN

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Modern Philology

VOL. V *April, 1908* No. 4

EL LIBRO DE LOS GATOS, A TEXT WITH INTRODUCTION AND NOTES[1]

MANUSCRIPT

The *Libro de los gatos* is found in a single MS, No. 1182 of the Biblioteca Nacional, Madrid. The volume so numbered is a codex, containing, besides the *Gatos*, a portion of Climente Sánchez's *Libro de los exenplos por A B C.* The codex is bound in parchment and bears on the back the title, *Exemplos y Fabulas Morales.* The pages are of paper, measuring 13.05 by 19 centimeters. The codex contains 205 folios. The numeration of the folios is incorrect. After folio 152 of the *Exenplos*, comes 143, making a difference of 10 pages. The *Gatos* begins with 161*r* (171*r*) and ends 195*v* (205*v*) in the middle of a fable, the last pages of the MS being lost.

The codex is the work of five hands of the fifteenth or early sixteenth century.[2] The first hand ends in folio 42*v;* the

[1] I offer grateful acknowledgment to Professor Karl Pietsch, of the University of Chicago, both for suggesting to me this subject for investigation and for his constant helpful advice. I also wish to thank Professor T. A. Jenkins, of the same university, for many useful hints, and Dr. M. A. Buchanan, of the University of Toronto, for several valuable suggestions and for his kindness in lending me his copies of the *Exenplos* MSS. I am indebted to my colleague on the Princeton faculty, Dr. G. D. Kellogg, for aid in locating a Latin quotation.

[2] Gayangos, *Escritores en prosa anteriores al siglo XV* (Madrid, 1884), pp. 443 ff., states that the hand in which the *Gatos* is written is contemporary with those written by the scribes who wrote the *Exenplos* which he places in the fifteenth century. Morel-Fatio, *Rom.*, Vol. VII, p. 482, places the latter MS at the beginning of the fifteenth century. As I am unable to see any essential difference between the hands of the codex, and as the paper throughout is of the same kind, I would place the *Gatos* MS at the beginning of the fifteenth century.

second begins with 43*r* and continues to 54*v;* the third extends to 89*r*, the middle of the page, the rest of which folio with all of 90 is blank; the fourth hand finishes the *Exenplos*. The *Gatos* is the work of a single hand, differing from all the others. The paper is identical with that on which the *Exenplos* is written.

The copying of both MSS has been hastily and carelessly done. Only seldom have the scribes made corrections. There is no attempt at ornamentation, although the first two lines of each fable have been indented for a possible future illumination. The titles of the fables, including the title *Libro de los gatos*, are written in the same character that is used in the body of the text. The MS is legible and well preserved. A few pages are slightly perforated but not sufficiently to interfere with the reading of the text.

EDITIONS

The *Libro de los gatos* has been edited in its entirety but once, viz., by Pascual de Gayangos in Vol. LI of the *Biblioteca de autores españoles* (Madrid, 1860). Subsequent editions of this work are merely reprints from the same plates. As is well known, the Gayangos edition is insufficient for the needs of the philologist. Orthography is sometimes modernized but not consistently. Manifest errors are left uncorrected or else arbitrarily emended. In general, when liberties are taken with the text, no mention of the fact is made. The editor was, of course, handicapped by not knowing that the work is a translation. By using the original to correct his text, he could have explained many puzzling passages. Amador de los Ríos in Vol. IV of his *Historia crítica* (Madrid, 1863, pp. 322–25), reproduces seven of these fables, those numbered in my edition, III, IV, XIX, XLIII, XLIX, LV, LVI. Menéndez y Pelayo in his *Orígenes de la novela*, Vol. I (Madrid, 1905, pp. ciii f.), reproduces Fables X and XIX.

The *Gatos* is a translation of the *Fabulae* of the English monk, Odo of Cheriton.[1] The most important editions are those of Oesterley, *Jrb. f. rom. u. eng. Lit.*, Vol. IX, pp. 121 ff.; Vol. XII, pp. 129 ff.; Voigt, *Kleinere lateinische Denkmäler der Thiersage*

[1] For a discussion of Odo's name, birthplace, epoch, and biography, cf. Hervieux, *op. cit.*, chap. i.

(Strassburg, 1878); Hervieux, *Les fabulistes latins*, Vol. IV (Paris, 1896).[1] For an Old French translation, cf. Paul Meyer, *Rom.*, Vol. XIV, pp. 381 ff., and Hervieux, *op. cit.*, pp. 85 ff.

ORDER OF THE FABLES

Before studying the relation of the Spanish version to the Latin MSS of Odo, it is convenient to inquire whether the fable-order as we have it in the codex represents the order of its Latin original. The original order of Odo's fables has been worked out, first approximately by Voigt,[2] and later completely by Hervieux.[3] The latter was in possession of more material for the task, and with a few corrections which I shall indicate in the footnotes, I accept as accurate the order he gives. On comparing the *Gatos* fables as they appear in the codex or as published by Gayangos, it is at once apparent that the order differs from Hervieux's norm. A single change, however, is all that is necessary to make the order of the *Gatos* conform perfectly with that of the best Odo MSS as determined by Hervieux. The displacement of one or two folios of a parent MS is what has caused the trouble, the question of the number of course depending upon the size of the folio of the parent MS. Fable XXIV, to use my system of numeration, has been split into two parts by the insertion of the *Enxienplo dela gulpeja conlas galinas* (LI); *Enxienplo delo que acaesçio ala gulpeja conlas ouejas* (LII); *Enxienplo del conde conlos mercaderes* (LIII); and the first part of the *Enxienplo de vna oveja blanca e de vn asno e un cabron* (LIV). In the middle of the latter story, the end of Fable XXIV awkwardly joins on. Also, at the place where the folio or folios dropped out, the junction is no less awkward. To the *Enxienplo dela gulpeja* (L), is attached part of the moral of LIV.

This glaring disarrangement of the text, apparently noticed by neither Gayangos nor Knust,[4] was pointed out by Voigt,[5] but the latter is doubtless wrong in asserting that the change took place

[1] For less important reproductions of Odo's fables, cf. Hervieux, *op. cit.*, pp. 78 ff.

[2] Voigt, *op. cit.*, pp. 157 ff. [3] Hervieux, *op. cit.*, pp. 41 ff.

[4] Knust, *Jrb. f. rom. u. eng. Lit.*, Vol. VI, pp. 1-42, 119-41.

[5] *Op. cit.*, p. 40.

"*in der lateinischen Vorlage.*" That the shift did not take place in the existing Spanish MS is plain, because in both places the faulty junctions occur in the middle of a page and in the middle of a line as well. A study of our MS makes it plain that it cannot have been the original version of the translation. The mistake then could just as easily have been made in a Spanish MS. A translator, had the mistake already existed in Latin, would have been more likely to detect and correct it than the more mechanical scribe. Furthermore, after studying the sentence interrupted by the displacement, it seems to me that however much garbled it may be, it shows that the translator had before him the Latin sentence as a whole. I have therefore restored the fables to their original order and find the fable-order of the *Gatos* and the best Odo MSS to be identical, with the exception of the *Enxienplo del fraire* (XL), not found in any of the Odo MSS and which I agree with Hervieux in thinking a mere continuation of the moral of the preceding fable. The long continuation of XXV, which too is not to be found in any of the Latin MSS available to me, did not exist in the original Latin MS. This rearrangement has necessitated a system of numeration different from that adopted by Gayangos. I have not sought to separate several fables printed under one title, except in the case of the fragment XXII, which was joined by mistake to XXI, owing to the dropping out of a folio. This is the sole instance where I have given a number to a fable without a title. What follows is Hervieux's list of Odo's fables. The number preceding is Hervieux's, the Roman numeral following is mine, and the number in brackets following the Roman numeral represents Gayangos' system of numeration. Where the numeral in brackets is omitted, the two systems of numeration coincide.

1. Qualiter elegerunt sibi regem ligna.
1*a*. De formicis.[1]
1*b*. Qualiter rane elegerunt sibi regem.[1]

[1] Herlet, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der äsopischen Fabel im Mittelalter* (Bamberg, 1892), p. 14, points out that 1*a* and 1*b* nowhere occur in the same MS but are variants of the same story. He says that 1*a* is merely a shortened form of 1*b*. But we might as easily say that 1*b* is an expanded form of 1*a*. I incline to the latter opinion, inasmuch as 1*a* occurs in four of the MSS acknowledged to be the most reliable, and 1*b* has the authority of only one MS of this group.

1*c*. Qualiter pulli elegerunt sibi regem.[1]
1*d*. Qualiter volucres elegerunt regem.[1]
1*e*. De abbate, cibo et monachis.
2. De niso et columba et duce.
2*a*. De scrabone.
3. De cornice.
4. De busardo et de nido ancipitris.
4*a*. De cucula et burneta.
5. De tortuca et aquila. I.
6. De ciconia et lupo. II.
7. De quadam ave sancti martini. III.
8. De oculis calvi lacrimantibus et perdicibus. IV.
9. De ave qui (sic) dicitur frangens[os]–fre[i]nos. V.
10. De aquila.
11. De ciconia et uxore.
12. De heretico et musca. VI.
13. De fenice.
14. De filio bufonis et sotularibus. VII.
14*a*. De juvene et vetula. VIII.
15. De cato qui se fecit monachum. IX.
15*a*. De aranea. IX.
15*b*. De musca. X.
16. De mure domestica et silvestri vel campestri. XI.
17. De quodam animali quod vocatur antiplos. XII.
18. De ydro et cocodrillo exemplum. XIII.
19. De vulpe et lupo et situla putei. XIV.
20. De leone et lupo et volpe et venatoribus. XV.
21. De caseo et rato et cato. XVI.
21*a*. De canibus et cornicibus. XVII.
21*b*. De mure, rana et milvo. XVIII.
22. De lupo qui voluit esse monachus. XIX.
23. Quod oves sunt conqueste leoni de lupo. XX.
23*a*. Quidam commendavit XII oves compatri suo lupo. XXI.
24. De lupo et agno bibentibus.
25. De volpe qui (sic) confitebatur peccata sua gallo. XXII [21].
26. De asinis indutis pellibus leoninis. XXIII [22].
27. De Gautero querente locum ubi semper gauderet. XXIV [23, 27].
27*a*. De duobus sociis, uno verace, alio mendace. XXV [28].
28. De contentione vespe et aranee. XXVI [29].
28*a*. De sc(a)rabone. XXVII [30].
29. De aquila et corvo medico. XXVIII [31].

[1] 1*c* and 1*d* never occur together in the same MS. Of the two, 1*c* has better claims to authenticity. Herlet is entirely wrong, *op. cit.*, p. 14, in saying that it occurs in but one MS. Cf. Hervieux, *op. cit.*, p. 177. 1*d* is found in but four MSS; 1*c* in fifteen.

30. De milite venatore. XXIX [32].
30*a*. De leone qui invitavit bestias. XXIX [32].
31. De scrabonibus et rustico. XXX [33].
32. De ape et scrabone. XXXI [34].
33. De asino et porco. XXXII [35].
34. De pullo galline et milvo. XXXIII [36].
35. De convivio leonis et catti et ali[or]um. XXXIV [37].
36. De auca et corvo. XXXV [38].
36*a*. De quodam justo rogante dominum pro quodam peccatore. XXXV [38].
36*d*. De scacis.[1] XXXV [38].
37. De pullo indomito.
38. De milvo et perdicibus. XXXVI [39].
39. De fraudibus vulpis et catti. XXXVII [40].
40. De corvo et pullo columbe. XXXVIII [41].
41. De up(p)upa et philomena. XXXIX [42].
(*Enxienplo del fraire*). XL [43].
42. De quodam divite multas habente vaccas.[2]
42*a*. De simplicitate solventium censum. XLI [44].
42*b*. De industria formice. XLII [45].
43. De lupo sepulto. XLIII [46].
44. De cane stercorante. XLIV [47].
45. De unicorne et quodam homine. XLV [48].
46. De vulpe. XLVI [49].
47. De symia. XLVII [50].
48. De testudine. XLVIII [51].
48*a*. Item de testudine. XLVIII [51].
48*b*. De aranea et musca et burdone. XLIX [52].
49. De vulpe. L [53].
49*a*. Aliud exemplum. L [53].
50. De vulpe et gallinis. LI [24].
51. De fraude vulpis. LII [25].
51*a*. De fraude comitis. LIII [26].
52. De contentione ovis albe et ovis nigre, asini et hirci. LIV [27, 53].
53. De traha et bufone. LV [54].
54. De falcone et milvo.
54*a*. De muribus et catto et cetera. LVI [55].
55. De rosa et volatilibus.
56. De mure et catto. LVII [56].
56*a*. De pulice. LVII [56].
56*b*. De quodam Alexandro in periculo posito.

[1] At this point two fables have been omitted: 36*b*, *De quodam Stulto*, and 36*c*, *De quodam incantatore*. Herlet is doubtless right, *op. cit.*, p. 15, in considering them spurious.

[2] The authenticity of this fable may well be questioned.

56*c*. De grangia. LVIII [57].
57. De pellicano.
58. De contentione lupi et leporis. LIX [58].
59. De homine qui posuit serpentem in sinu suo.
59*a*. De homine ingrato et socio male remunerante.
60. De panthara.
61. De cane et frusto carnium.
62. De rana inflata.
62*a*. De filio militis.
63. De mure qui voluit matrimonium contrahere.
64. De pulchra uxore catti.
64*a*. De quadam domina.
65. De ciconia et serpente.
66. De pavone deplumato.
67. De bufone et rana.
67*a*. De cane et duobus hominibus.
68. De asino et leone.
69. De cane et asino et domino suo.
70. De caseo et corvo.
70*a*. De quodam atheniensi.
71. De ciconia et catto.
72. De claustrali ad idem.
73. De hirco equitante.
73*a*. De patre sene et filio suo et rege.
73*b*. De patre sene et filio suo.
74. De lupo et vulpe.
75. De musca et formica.

It can be seen from the above that the fables in the Spanish version, when once the one necessary correction has been made, nowhere depart from the correct order. The list has been given *in extenso* for the purpose of showing the degree of incompleteness of the *Gatos* as it has come down to us.

Relation of the Gatos MS to the various Latin MSS of Odo of Cheriton

After a careful study of the fable-order, Voigt divides the Odo MSS into three distinct groups, associating the *Gatos* MS with the best group of Latin MSS.[1] Herlet[2] completes Voigt and arrives at practically the same results, forming, however, four

[1] Voigt, *op. cit.*, pp. 40 ff. Voigt's designation of the MSS is different from that adopted by Hervieux and Herlet.

[2] Herlet, *op. cit.*, pp. 7 ff.

groups. According to the latter, the Latin MSS are thus arranged with regard to their fable-order:

Group I: AS, CA, P, MC, AD, DB, AR, V, DA, (BN).

Group II: G, MA, MB, MD, ME, AB.

Group III: CB, H.

Group IV: AA.[1]

The Spanish version belongs in Group I.

Having considered the MSS with regard to the order of the fables, let us now examine them with regard to content, especially the members of Group I to which the *Gatos* belongs.

The *Gatos* contains 5 fables not to be found in AS: 8, 21*a*, 36, 41, 56*a*;[2] none not to be found in CA;[3] 13 not found in P: 8, 12, 15*b*, 21*a*, 31, 35, 36, 41, 46, 51*a*, 56, 56*a*, 56*c*; 6 not found in MC: 8, 21*a*, 36, 41, 54*a*, 56*a*; 31 not found in AD; 45 not found in the fragment DB; 29 not found in AR; 21 not found in V; 10 not found in DA: 8, 12, 15*b*, 17, 21*a*, 36, 41, 48*a*, 49*a*, 56*a*; BN, the other MS of this group, is only a fragment containing eight fables in all.

Some of the MSS of Group II are very complete. Thus the *Gatos* has but 3 not found in MB: 9, 15*b*, 27; 2 not found in MD: 27, 36*a*; 3 not found in AB: 15*b*, 21*a*, 49*a*.

A glance is sufficient to show that there is but one of the above-mentioned MSS which, disregarding the interpolations in Fables

[1] The letters represent the following MSS: AS, Arras, 184; CA, Cambridge, Corpus Christi 441; P, Mazarine, 122; MC, Munich, 8,947; AD, Brit. Mus., Addit. 11,579; DB, Brit. Mus., Douce 101; AR, Berne 679; V, Breslau, IV Q 126; DA, Brit. Mus., Douce 88; BN, Berlin, Theol. lat. 4°, 10; G, Wolfenbüttel, Gude lat. 200; MA, Munich, lat. 2,800; MB, Munich, lat. 8,356; MD, Munich, lat. 14,749; ME, Munich, lat. 16,195; AB, Brit. Mus., Arundel 275; CB, Cambridge, Corpus Christi, 481; H, Brit. Mus., Harley 219; AA, Brit. Mus., Arundel 292. Herlet's classification leaves unaccounted for six MSS. DC, Brit. Mus., Douce 169, should be added to Group III. CL, Clermont-Ferrand 47 and RA, Brit. Mus., Rawlinson C 288, are too fragmentary and insufficiently described to admit of classification. Hervieux offers no satisfactory description of Berlin, Meerman 147, Munich 16,602, and one in the library of Ivrea, Italy. No Latin MS of Odo's fables is known to exist in Spain. I succeeded in finding at the Biblioteca Nacional, Madrid, a Latin MS of Odo's sermons not mentioned in Hervieux's list. It forms a quarto volume, is bound in parchment, and bears on the cover the title *Odonis Concion.* The full title found inside is *Oddo (Magister) sermones super epistolas dominicarum totius anni item aliorum festorum.* The first page is missing. Then follow seven pages of what appear to be notes or skeleton sermons. Pages 8–153 give complete sermons written in a finer hand, two columns to the page. The MS is numbered B 110, MS 95.

[2] The numbers are those of Hervieux's list. Cf. *supra.*

[3] Again I disregard the two stories which almost certainly did not belong to the Latin original: XL and the continuation to XXV.

XXV and XL, agrees with the *Gatos* perfectly, both as to order and to content. This MS is CA, which luckily is the best of all the known MSS of Odo and the one which Hervieux publishes *in extenso*. The question then to be answered is whether it can be considered a direct ancestor of the Spanish version. This can be determined only by a careful comparison of the two versions from the view-point of manuscript readings. I have collected a few interesting disagreements of the readings.

The following are instances where the *Gatos* offers a distinctly better reading than the Corpus Christi 441. The list is not complete. I have endeavored merely to give the most interesting and striking examples:

III: *ad modum juncti*	*ha manera de junco.*
IV: *calvi*	*caçador.*
V: *frangens*[*os*]	*quebranta huessos.*
VI: *Colosanis partibus*	*de Tollossa.*
VIII: *et dixi*[*t quidam*]	*E dixole vn.*
IX: *fecit sibi rari*	*se fiçiese façer la corona.*
XIV: [*in*]*uenie*(*n*)*s*	*Falaras.*
XXI: *Quoniam* [*peruersus prelatus*]	*Onde el mal perlado.*
XXIII: *Lingua tua manifestum te facit*	*La tu palabra te faz manifiesto:* (*Palabra* seems better in view of the Vulgate *loquela*).
XXVI: *Nichil uales*	*Tu nunca buelas.*
XXVIII: *monachi* (variant, *monoculi*)	*a*[*n*]*menos el vn ojo.*
XXXV: *Et ludunt* [*homines*]	*E llos onbres juegan.*
XXXVIII: *Canta melius, uel pullam* (*sic*) *non habebis*	*Canta mejor. Si non, non te dare tu fijo.*
XLVII: *G*[*regorius*]	*Gregorio.*
LIV: *Ecce quoniam* (AS and MB have *quam*) *albam pellem porto*	*Catad que pellejo trayo yo,* etc.

Unfortunately it is impossible to make a thorough investigation of this kind without copying and collating the 25 known MSS of Odo's fables. The best means we now have of comparing the MS readings is afforded by Voigt's *Kleinere lateinische Denkmäler der Thiersage*, where, in the 20 fables selected for

publication (mostly without the morals), he compares 11 MSS: DA, H, AS, MC, V, AA, BN, MD, MB, G, S, in addition to the *Gatos*. That is to say, he himself copied MB, MC, MD, G, and V and used whatever fables from the other MSS were at that time in print. I shall mention only a few instances where the *Gatos* agrees with these MSS rather than with CA.

Cf. II: CA: *quando seruiunt;* Voigt's text: *quando seruiunt dominis suis; Gatos: siruen allos señores; quando caput tuum fuit in ore meo;* MC and V have: *habui* for *fuit; quando te tenia la cabeça en la garganta.*

VII: *Dixit Bufo;* MC and V have *respondit; El bufo respondio.*

IX: *Numquam ita bene predicabis quod te dimittam, frater: quando volo, sum monachus;* V adds after *frater: sed scias; Ca, ermano, sepas que quando me pago so monje.*

XX: *Hoc dixerunt, quod Lupus frequenter inuitauit Porcos ad Agnos et Arietes quos rapuit.* After *ad* Voigt adds *comedendum* on the authority of MC alone; but cf. *Gatos: Esto deçian ellos por quanto el lobo les auia conbidados muchas vezes a comer delas ouejas que furtara.*

XXIX: *fuerunt ibi pulchra fercula et multe delicie?* MD has: *fuerunt ibi pulcra et bona cibaria et bene preparata? Ouistes buenos comeres e bien adobados?* MB has nearly the same: *Fuerunt utique multa et pulcra et bene preparata.* Voigt's text: *fuerunt utique capones et perdices et multa alia bene preparata; ouimos capones e perdiçes e pauones e otros muchos manjares bien adobados.*

Enough examples have now been given to prove that the *Gatos* cannot possibly be a descendant of CA. The study of the order of the fables and the content of the MSS has already shown that it can go back to none of the other MSS. It should be noticed that when the *Gatos* departs from the readings of CA, it most frequently agrees with MC or V, both MSS of the first group, although occasionally it agrees with a MS of the second group. From all this we must conclude that the Spanish text is based on one of the earliest MSS, one earlier than any now extant, the ancestor of both the Group I and the Group II MSS, which preserved the original order of the fables and was very complete in the matter of content and conservative in text. In emending the text, the greatest weight should be given CA, because this MS is the most perfect of any of the Odo MSS preserved to us, and also because it is probably the MS most closely related to our

text. The number of instances where the *Gatos* departs from the Corpus Christi readings is small in comparison to the number of times when the two agree in opposition to other MSS. In my notes I shall several times have occasion to point out cases where the two agree in their errors, thus affording proof of an intimate connection. However, care must be taken to control the Corpus Christi readings with those of other MSS, and this I have endeavored to do as far as I have been able with the limited material at my command.

It must next be asked whether the *Gatos* text, as we have it, is the original translation or a later copy. To this I can unhesitatingly answer that it is a copy and not the original Spanish version. There are two distinct classes of errors to be found in it. First, those due to corruptions in the Latin prototype or to the failure of the translator to understand what was before him, and second, confusions which can only have arisen in copying the Spanish. I shall give a few of the more interesting errors which seem to me to prove the intervention of several copyists after the fables had received their Spanish form. I am aware that I am here assuming the accuracy of my own emendations, but the greater number of them are, I think, sufficiently obvious.

I: *mal lugar de sus grados* becomes *mal lugar mal de su grado.*
IX: *ayunan e rrezan* becomes *ay vna erreza.*
XI: *como* becomes *con; como* becomes *commo, et passim.*
XV: *pasaron* becomes *pasequio; yras* becomes *yeruas.*
XIX: *all asno* becomes *allas non; comieron* becomes *cometieron.*
XXII: *quanto* becomes *quando, et passim.*
XXIV: *casas* becomes *cosas, et passim; destorpalo* becomes *destero palo; que en* becomes *quien.*
XXVII: *follada* becomes *fallada; al sy* becomes *ausi.*
XXXII: *logreros* becomes *logar dos.*
XXXIX: *podresçer* becomes *paresçer.*
XLI: *vanse* becomes *ansi.*
XLIII: *commo* becomes *comio.*
LII: *penso* becomes *puso*(?).
LIV: *Las pasçera* becomes *la asperçera; rayan* becomes *trayan.*

This list is far from complete; a study of the variants and notes will reveal similar errors. The mistakes quoted appear to have

arisen entirely within the Spanish. Therefore, at least one copy, and probably several, intervened between the original Spanish version and ours.

The work of the translator has been extremely well done. His few mistakes are pardonable in view of the difficulties under which he labored. He is possessed of no small literary skill, and while sometimes influenced by the Latin idiom, he seldom offends by barbarisms. He is true to the genius of the Castilian, and as that language tends toward diffuseness, it is not strange that in his hands, Odo's concise, nervous sentences are expanded. To precisely what extent the translator asserted his independence and originality, in the absence of the lost original, it is difficult to determine. Fable XL and the continuation to XXV, together with the many lengthenings of the morals, may have first appeared in the Latin.

Oesterley, in first pointing out the fact that the *Gatos* is a translation from the Latin of Odo, expatiates on the literalness of the translation.[1] Knust rightly takes issue with Oesterley, pointing out that the *Gatos* is anything but a literal translation of the MS published by Oesterley, Arundel 292, which, by the way, is the least trustworthy of all the MSS of Odo.[2] However, Knust goes too far in assuming originality on the part of the translator, and his arguments apparently have no weight with Oesterley who reiterates that the *Gatos* is "a slavishly accurate translation of Odo's work."[3] If instead of Arundel 292 we compare the *Gatos* with better MSS, the resemblance becomes closer, so that if we were to recover the lost original, we might find the translation to be almost literal. My own opinion is that with the possible exception of the two fables mentioned and a few expanded morals, the translator invents nothing; but it is undoubtedly true that he expresses himself with less conciseness than his original and prefers to write easy, flowing, natural Spanish rather than to stick slavishly to the letter of his text.

There is unfortunately nothing in the MS throwing light upon the translator's personality. He must, however, in all probability

[1] Cf. *Jrb. f. rom. u. eng. Lit.*, Vol. IX, p. 126.

[2] *Ibid.*, Vol. X, pp. 43 ff.

[3] *Ibid.*, Vol. XII, p. 129.

have belonged to the clergy, and unless we assume that the many Leonisms to be found in the *Gatos* are due to subsequent copyists, he must have lived in León or not far from the Leonese-Castilian boundary. We know the *Libro de exenplos* to have been written by Climente Sánchez, archdeacon of Valderas. According to Morel-Fatio,[1] the date of its composition was between 1400 and 1421 A. D. The same authority places the date of the Madrid MS of the *Exenplos* (that of our codex) at the beginning of the fifteenth century.[2] Now, Valderas is almost exactly on the border-line between León and Castile. We should expect a MS written there to show traces of the eastern Leonese dialect. These peculiarities abound in the Madrid MS of the *Exenplos*. Many of the same dialectic traces, the most important of which is the palatalization of initial *l*, occur in the *Gatos* MS.[3] It is therefore a possibility that the *Gatos* may have been translated or copied at Valderas.

THE TITLE

The bizarre title borne by this work has long been a subject of speculation on the part of historians of Spanish literature. Gayangos, the first to comment upon the name, contents himself with saying that it is *enteramente arbitrario no habiendo en su contenido nada que lo justifique.*[4] But if the title be entirely arbitrary, as Gayangos supposes, we have to do with an unusual instance, because Spanish authors or copyists of the Middle Ages were not accustomed to affix arbitrary or fantastic titles to their works. A Montaigne with his playful fancy may delight in mystifying the reader by giving his essays captions little justified by what follows; but to suppose our monkish copyist or translator capable of a similar *jeu d'esprit* seems scarcely probable.

Amador de los Ríos thinks the title due to the "*arañazos*," or "scratches," which in the morals to his fables, the author gives to all those who have "aroused his bile" by their offenses against morality and justice.[5]

[1] *Rom.*, Vol. VII, p. 483. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 482.

[3] These Leonisms with instances from the *Exenplos* will be pointed out in the footnotes as they occur in the text.

[4] Gayangos, *op. cit.*, p. 445.

[5] Amador de los Ríos, *Hist. crit.* (Madrid, 1865), Vol. IV, p. 319.

Herman Knust advances two explanations.[1] He supposes, first, that several stories at the beginning had been lost and that in these lost stories might be found the clue to the strange title. We know that Knust was perfectly correct in supposing that several of the first stories had been lost and we also know, what he did not, just what those stories were. Having established the correct fable-order, we find that the *Gatos* lacks the initial prologue and at least nine fables.[2] Now, neither in the prologue nor in any one of these stories is there the slightest reference to a cat. Knust's second theory is of less importance. Puzzled by the reference in XXIV to *El Libro del Oso*,[3] he assumed that it may have been the custom to give collections of animal stories the name of some one animal. This argument is overthrown by the discovery that the correct reading is *Ose* (i. e., the Book of Hosea) instead of *Oso*.[4] This leaves Knust with no other Spanish instance of a collection of animal apologues bearing the name of a single animal.

Baist[5] supposes that there may have existed an illuminated MS in which the paintings of cats figuring in *Enxienplos* IX, XI, XVI, XXXIV, XXXVII, LVI, LVII were sufficiently prominent to give the work its title.[6] Of course Baist intends this merely as a suggestion. We have no evidence to show that an illuminated MS, either in the Spanish or the Latin, ever existed. But, assuming that there was an illuminated MS, why should the cat have given the collection its name rather than the wolf or the fox? It will be observed that the cat figures in seven fables. The wolf

[1] *Jrb. f. rom. u. eng. Lit.*, Vol. VI, p. 130.

[2] For these stories, cf. the fable-order given above.

[3] Cf. Gayangos, *op. cit.*, p. 549.

[4] Cf. my article in *Mod. Lang. Notes*, January, 1905. Since then, Menéndez y Pelayo in his *Orígenes de la novela* (Madrid, 1905), Vol. I, p. civ, repeats the same mistake. In discussing the *Libro de los exenplos* and the *Gatos* he says: *No fueron ciertamente las únicas obras que se compusieron ó tradujeron al castellano en aquella primera edad de nuestra literatura. En esos mismos libros encontramos mencionados otros cuyos títulos excitan sobremanera la curiosidad. ¿Qué sería el Libro del Oso, alegado en el de los Gatos? ¿Qué el libro de las trufas de los pleytos de Julio César, citado por el compilador del Libro de los Exemplos?* The latter title, like *El libro del oso*, is due to a paleographic blunder, as Dr. M. A. Buchanan has shown (cf. *Mod. Lang Notes*, December, 1904). Menéndez y Pelayo depends almost entirely on Amador de los Ríos for his information about the *Gatos*. It is only in the *Adiciones y Rectificaciones* that he indicates positively that the work is a translation from the Latin. He also gives there a reference to Knust's article in the *Jahrbuch*. He apparently does not know Voigt, Hervieux, and Herlet.

[5] Cf. Gröber's *Grundriss*, Vol. II[2], p. 414, Anmk.

[6] The numbers here as always are according to my system, not to that of Gayangos.

appears in ten (II, XIV, XV, XIX, XX, XXI, XXIV, XXIX, XLIII, LIX). Notice that the wolf appears in II, whereas the cat first appears in IX. The fox appears in eight (XIV, XV, XXV, XXXVII, XLVI, L, LI, LII). The lion appears in Fables VII, XV, XX, XXIV, XXXIV, XLIII, LIX, and the lion's skin is mentioned in XXIII. The mouse appears in six fables, and other animals are mentioned a few times. Why should not illuminated drawings of these animals have been as striking as those of the cat?

A late utterance on the subject is that of Menéndez y Pelayo who says: *Acaso el autor entendía figuradamente por gatos á los que son blanco predilecto de su sátira.*[1] If that were so, we should expect to find the cat typical always of the same thing. But what is the case? In IX the cat stands for the hypocritical clerk; in XI for the devil; in XVI for the churchman who plunders his charge; in XXXIV for those using foul language; in XXXVII for the simple and the good; in LVI for the clergy who revolt against tyrannical bishops and abbots; in LVII for God. There is surely nothing in all this that would justify one in considering the cat as typical of those incurring Odo's anger.

None of the foregoing explanations appears plausible to me. To my mind, the most natural explanation is that the word *gatos* is the result of a paleographic blunder. Throughout the text most of the absurdities and errors are due to mistakes on the part either of translator or scribe. To assume something of the kind to have occurred in the title, seems to me the most natural explanation. But to determine just what the error was is extremely difficult, if not impossible. To make my argument convincing, it would be necessary to find some word so closely resembling *gatos* and so manifestly belonging in the title that there would be no room for doubt. Yet everybody knows that words having only a remote resemblance are constantly confused by the scribes. All I shall attempt to do then is to make a few suggestions as my predecessors have done. It is extremely doubtful whether the mystery of the title *Gatos* will ever definitely be solved, unless another MS, throwing light on the subject, be discovered.

[1] *Op. cit.*, p. ciii.

If the text of the *Gatos* is a translation from the Latin, it is possible that the title is a translation also. It is well to start our inquiry by ascertaining the correct Latin title. The title borne by the Corpus Christi 441 is: *Incipit prologus in parabolis magistri Odonis ad laudem ipsius qui est alpha et omega.*[1] At the end we find: *Expliciunt parabole magistri O. ad laudem ipsius qui est alpha et* Ω. The titles vary greatly in the various MSS.[2] In nearly all occur the words *Magistri Odonis* or *Ottonis.* Could these words, written in abbreviated form, and not being understood as a proper name, have been changed to *Gatos?* In such a case, we should have a no more arbitrary change than the rendering of *traha* by *galápago* (LV). It may well be objected that if the prologue and nine initial fables are lost in the Spanish, we should hardly expect the original title to be preserved. To this it may be said that the title was in the best MSS repeated at the end and from there could have been restored to the beginning.

Another possibility is that the original title was *El libro de los quentos. Quentos* and *gatos* could easily be confused. Throughout the text *g* and *q* are frequently wrongly interchanged. The word *enxienplos* would be a more natural word to use than *quentos*, but two works in the same codex could not well have the same title. Moreover, there is an instance of the use of *quentos* in this way at this same period where, in the *Espejo de los legos* MSS, there are frequent references to a *Libro de los quentos.*[3]

Other possible explanations of the title have occurred to me, but it is useless to multiply suggestions. I insist upon neither of the above-attempted explanations, only on the general principle that a paleographic blunder probably is the cause of this strange title.

[1] This is evidently the title in its true and original form. The best MSS closely approximate it. Hervieux, *op. cit.*, p. 72, gives this title differently from the way it appears in the text, p. 173.

[2] For the titles borne by the various MSS, cf. Hervieux, *op. cit.*, pp. 48 ff.

[3] I am unfortunately unable to say exactly what work is referred to by the title *Libro de los quentos.* The title is of course the translation of some Latin title cited by Hoveden. The book was apparently some collection of stories about the saints and fathers. Not seeing at the time when I had access to the MSS that it had any bearing on this subject, I made no effort to identify the work.

SOURCES

It is no part of my task to investigate the sources of Odo of Cheriton's fables. Herlet, in the work to which I have already several times referred, has attempted to do this in the case of those stories which have to do with the Aesopic fable. Those narratives which are derived from the Bestiaries and a large number of miscellaneous tales, he purposely leaves unnoticed. But while a more thoroughgoing study of Odo's sources is much to be desired, it does not come within the scope of this investigation.

The most important portion of *El libro de los gatos* not traceable to Odo is found in *Enxienplo* XXV. This story is an awkwardly joined composite of two similar tales, only the first of which goes back to Odo.[1] For the source of the first story, cf. Herlet.[2] Odo undoubtedly obtained the story, directly or indirectly, from some version of the Romulus,[3] which in turn got it from Phaedrus.[4] For a further study of this tale, cf. Köhler.[5] That in the original of Odo this story appeared without the addition of a second seems certain. In none of the MSS other than the Spanish version does it appear, in so far as I have been able to determine, although the addition may have taken place in the Latin fully as well as in the Spanish. Odo concludes with a verse which plainly marks the end of the fable: *Et quandoque nocet omnia uera loqui.*[6]

The other story added to this is one of the best-known and most widely disseminated of folk-tales. Nearly every nation of western Asia, northern Africa, and continental Europe has its version. The most complete study of this folk-tale has been made by Köhler.[7] I shall not reproduce the very complete list of variants there described. Next in importance to the work of

[1] I have been anticipated in pointing this out by Becker, *Literaturblatt f. ger. u. rom. Phil.*, Vol. XXVI, p. 374. Köhler failed to observe this, although he has made separate studies of both stories.

[2] Herlet, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der äsopischen Fabel im Mittelalter* (Bamberg, 1892), p. 16.

[3] *Romulus* (ed. Oesterley, Berlin, 1870), p. 82.

[4] Hervieux, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 150.

[5] Köhler, *Kleinere Schriften* (ed. Bolte, Berlin, 1900), Vol. II, pp. 369 ff.

[6] Voigt, *op. cit.*, p. 122, says: *Der Spruch stammt wörtlich aus Pamphili Mauril. eleg. de amore III 54 (Goldast catal. p. 79).*

[7] *Op. cit.*, Vol. I, pp. 281 ff.

Köhler is that of Cosquin,[1] whose bibliography has been utilized by Bolte in bringing the Köhler article up to date. To the bibliography offered by Köhler and Bolte, I have only a few additions to make.

Allusion is made to an ancient Hebrew version of this story published by Gaster in *Folklore*, Vol. VII, p. 217. But no allusion is made to an almost identical Hebrew version published by Schechter in the same journal, Vol. I, p. 277, of whose existence Gaster too was apparently unaware.

Allusion is made to Andrews, the story of "Les deux marchands," *Contes Ligures* (Paris, 1892), pp. 55 ff., but no mention is made of "Le méchant frère," pp. 271 ff., a much more complete and interesting version of our story. Andrews also gives references to Visentini, *Fiabe mantovane*, No. 17, and to Wratislaw, *Slavonic Folk-Tales*, No. 14, which ought to have been utilized.

Köhler and Bolte make no mention of the important study devoted to this tale by Clouston, "The Good Man and the Bad Man," *Popular Tales and Fictions* (Edinburgh and London, 1887), Vol. I, pp. 249 ff. Clouston's bibliography is very incomplete. He is ignorant of much that has been said before him, but as an orientalist he mentions several eastern versions not previously pointed out.

Groome, *Gypsy Folk-Tales* (London, 1889), p. 112, has a most interesting version of the story gathered among the Bukowina Gypsies.[2]

Two recent works by the Hungarian, Lajos Katona, offer new material for the study of this fable.[3] The Pelbárt story reproduced by him agrees with the *Gatos* version in several important particulars. There is a wager ending in the blinding of the exponent of justice, who recovers his sight, cures a princess of blindness, is heaped with riches, and the advocate of injustice is punished. The points of difference are that demons rather than

[1] Cosquin, *Contes populaires de Lorraine* (Paris, 1887), Vol. I, pp. 84 ff.

[2] Groome gives a reference to another version unnoticed by Köhler and Bolte: Denton, *Serbian Folk-Lore*, pp. 83 ff.

[3] Katona, *Temesvári Pelbárt példái, székfoglaló értekezés K. L. l. tagtói* (Budapest, 1892). Katona, *Specimina et elenchus exemplorum quae in Pomerio serm. quadragesimalium et de tempore Fr. Pelbarti Temesvár occurrunt* (Budapest, no date). Bolte gives a reference to Katona, *Ethnol. Mitteil. aus Ungarn*, II, 38, 159.

animals reveal the secret of curing blindness; the cure is effected by a herb instead of water; the princess is cured instead of the king, and she is afflicted with blindness rather than dumbness. The unjust man is blinded rather than killed. These are variants found in many other versions. Katona cites another version from cod. lat. saec. XV, n. 123, Mus. Nat. Hung., *qui "Magister Esopianus et Avianus inscribitur."* Two friends wager their eyes as to the relative merits of Truth and Falsehood. Being in Rome, they leave the question to many citizens whom they meet, who render a verdict in favor of Falsehood. Truth is blinded and lies down in a doorway. Rome happening to be without a king, an important senator is informed by an angel from heaven to seek a blind man in an indicated portal, to cure his blindness by means of dew, and to make him king. Truth thus becomes king, and Falsehood wishing a similar fortune has himself blinded. He remains blind for life. Here we seem to have a crossing of our story with the Alexis legend.

Becker, speaking of the story in question, says:

> Diese Erzählung ist in zahlreichen Varianten verbreitet, die alle—auch die bei Pauli, *Schimpf und Ernst*—unzweifelhaft auf Pelbárt zurückgehen, alle bis auf eine: im *Libro de los gatos* . . . . Wie wohl dieses Märchen einerseits nach Spanien, andererseits nach Ungarn gelangt sein mag? Pelbárt hat es gewiss nicht aus dem "Katzenbuch," eine gemeinsame Quelle ist nicht nachgewiesen. Sollte es etwa nach beiden Ländern direkt aus dem Orient gekommen sein? Vgl. über eine ältere jüdische Fassung, R. Köhler *Kl. Schr.* I, 287, *Folk-Lore* VII, 230.[1]

There are mentioned in the Köhler article, which it will be seen Becker knows, several oriental versions such as that found in the *Arabian Nights*, which the reviewer might also have mentioned as well as the Jewish version. But if we assume that Becker has reference merely to European folk-lore variants, it still seems to me impossible to believe that a story so varying in detail and so widely disseminated can owe its source exclusively (with the single exception of the *Gatos*) to a Hungarian preacher of the late fifteenth century.

Although several who have studied this story have referred to

[1] *Loc. cit.*, p. 374.

versions found in the *Arabian Nights*, two new variants and some new material in the way of bibliography are offered by Chauvin.[1]

It must now be inquired which of the many variants most closely resemble the *Gatos* version. Like my predecessors, I have been unable to discover a direct source. Neither can I undertake to say whether the story, as we have it, first appeared in the Spanish or in some Latin MS of Odo, in which latter case it may have been written in some other country than Spain. The fact that the moral is formally introduced by the word *Enxienplo*, nowhere else the case in the *Gatos*, may indicate that the story was copied from some other formal collection of *exempla*. The whole tone of the story is oriental. Beyond the ejaculation, *Santa Maria!* there is nothing European in it. Many later versions have a distinct local flavor.

Köhler has shown that the German and Scandinavian versions agree closely with ours. Of these, the closest is that of Pröhle, *Märchen für die Jugend*, No. 1, where not only is the wager preserved, but the animals mentioned are the same. Those of Grundtvig, *Gamle danske minder*, Vol. III, p. 118, and Asbjörnsen und Moe, *Norske Folkeeventyr*, No. 49, lack the wager, but animals rather than witches or devils reveal the secrets. It is not surprising if in the course of centuries, these orally transmitted stories vary so much from our older tale. A closer resemblance may therefore not indicate closer original relationship so much as greater fidelity in transmission. The French versions as a whole do not bear as close a resemblance to the *Gatos* as do the German. The versions of Cosquin[2] and Cerquand[3] lack the wager but mention animals.

A version which seems to me to preserve the tale in a form close to the original and to bear a resemblance to the *Gatos* version is one written in the Pāmir dialect, the most northeasterly of the Iranian group of languages.[4] The story is as follows: A

[1] Chauvin, *Bibliographie des ouvrages arabes* (Paris, 1901), Vol. V, pp. 13-15.

[2] *Op. cit.*, pp. 84 ff.

[3] Cerquand, *Légendes et récits populaires du pays basque* (Pau, 1875), Vol. I, Nos. 94, 95.

[4] Shaw, *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, Vol. XLV, 1876, pp. 177 ff. Reproduced in the *Grundriss d. iranischen Phil.* (eds. Geiger u. Kuhn, Vol. I, Pt. II, Strassburg, 1898-1901), pp. 333 ff. This version, which has not been cited by any of the authors whom I have studied, was indicated to me by Dr. Pietsch.

good man and a bad man set out on a journey. The bad man has bread, the good man none. The latter, suffering from hunger, parts with an eye for a little bread. Later he loses the second in the same manner. A friendly dog leads the good man to a pit where he decides to pass the night. While there he overhears the conversation of a wolf, a bear, a fox, and a witch. The fox relates that the king's daughter is blind but can be easily cured if one were to kill a she-goat and apply the hide to the princess. The bear relates another method of curing blindness. Near the pit there is a plane tree and near the plane tree a pond. One has only to dip one's hand in the water, rub it on the plane tree, and then on one's eyes to be cured. In the morning, the good man cures himself in the second of the two ways indicated, then the princess according to the manner prescribed by the fox. He marries the princess and becomes king. He obtains revenge by hiding a treasure in the pit and telling his cruel friend about it. The latter is discovered and killed by the animals.

It will be observed that the wager feature is lacking. An interesting characteristic is that both animals and a witch take part in the meeting. This suggests the possibility that both the fables which mention witches or spirits and those which mention animals may go back to an original which combined the two. The animals mentioned in this story are precisely those mentioned in the *Gatos*.

A similar observation may be made about the means of curing blindness mentioned in the various versions. In some the cure is brought about by the application of water; in others by the application of grass, the leaf of a certain tree, or some vegetable. In the cure suggested by the bear, we have apparently a combination of the water and the vegetable cures.

Fable XL, the other tale which I have been unable to trace back to Odo, is a banal account of a miracle worked by a cross. The motive is similar to many others to be found in monkish chronicles. In this connection, cf. the almost identical story, reproduced in the note to Fable XL, which I found ascribed to Odo in the *Espejo de los legos*. (Cf. p. 65.)

As for the sources of the fables which go back to Odo, I shall

merely give references to Herlet who has already investigated the subject, and to Chauvin whose admirable *Bibliographie des ouvrages arabes* gives nearly all that is necessary to the student in the way of bibliographical aid for the study of fable literature. I shall also try to indicate such parallels as are to be found in the old Spanish literature. Herlet refers to the fables according to Hervieux's numeration. Cf. table in section on Fable-Order above.

THE LITERARY VALUE OF *EL LIBRO DE LOS GATOS*

Various have been the judgments pronounced by the critics as to the literary value of *El libro de los gatos*. The earliest to express their opinions were unaware that the work is a translation and hence were guilty of many absurd errors.

Pascual de Gayangos, in his Spanish translation of Ticknor's *History of Spanish Literature*[1] was the first to make generally known the existence of the codex containing the *Enxemplos* and the *Gatos*. He was also the first to publish the two named works in Vol. LI of the Rivadeneyra series. His estimate of the worth of the *Gatos* is singularly inadequate and mistaken. After writing at length of the *Enxenplos*, he says: *desde el fol. 161 hasta el fin, se halla una coleccion de cuentos, recogidos sin mas objeto aparente que el de entretener ó agradar á los lectores.*[2] To one acquainted with Odo's intense earnestness, such a characterization is little short of ridiculous.

Ticknor, in editions of his *History of Spanish Literature* published subsequently to the appearance of Gayangos' work, makes reference to the *Enxenplos* and the *Gatos* in a note. He says of the *Gatos:* "It (*El libro de los enxenplos*) is followed in the same volume by another collection of tales and fables called *El libro de los gatos*, but it is a work of small value." This sweeping assertion is to be attributed probably to the misleading dictum of his predecessor.[3]

A more kindly critic and the real discoverer of the *Gatos* as a work of true literary merit, was José Amador de los Ríos, who,

[1] Ticknor, *Historia de la literatura española* (translated by Pascual de Gayangos, Madrid, 1851), Vol. I, pp. 502 f.

[2] Gayangos, *Escritores en prosa* (Madrid, 1884), p. 445.

[3] Ticknor, *History of Spanish Literature* (Boston, 1891), Vol. I, p. 81.

however great the errors into which he fell, was not as blind as his predecessors.[1] He sees in it a work of satire of the first importance. He recognizes fully the nobility and courage of the writer in upholding the down-trodden peasant against robber baron and self-seeking priest. His patriotic pride is untroubled by a knowledge of the fact that the original version was written in England. But de los Ríos is in the main correct in his judgments. To quote:

Antes bien, aunque mucho menos numerosa y desprovista de los epígrafes poéticos que exornan la gran coleccion ya reconocida, (the Exenplos) ofrece esta mayor interés á la crítica, por el sentido práctico que la anima, encaminada á producir el efecto inmediato de la correccion de las costumbres, por medio de la sátira. Mas no es la sátira del Libro de los Gatos la mezquina y bastarda satisfaccion de odios personales, nacidos en la tristeza del bien ageno y alimentados por el anhelo de alevosas venganzas: protesta noble de la virtud contra los vicios que plagaban la sociedad española del siglo XIV, manifestacion generosa del sentimiento de la justicia contra la opresion egercida por las clases privilegiadas, en cuyas manos estaban el poder y las riquezas, cumple la sátira en este raro monumento con la inevitable ley de su legítima existencia, revelando el angustioso estado interior del pueblo, en cuyo seno recibia extraordinario cultivo.

Hermann Knust is another who values the *Gatos* more highly than does Ticknor.[2] He, too, is wholly unaware that the work he discusses is a translation until enlightened by Hermann Oesterley, the first to point out the true source of the Spanish work.[3] Knust appreciates thoroughly the satiric side of the *Gatos*, the high moral purpose of the author, and the higher conception of Christianity which it has, compared to that of the *Enxenplos* and similar collections. But he goes astray when he assumes the *Gatos* to be an original work, and through internal evidence, tries to prove that it was written in Spain during the reign of Alfonso el Sabio.

Menéndez y Pelayo,[4] the latest critic to pronounce an opinion,

[1] Amador de los Rios, *op. cit.*, Vol. IV, pp. 320 ff.

[2] Knust, *Jrb. f. rom. u. eng. Lit.*, Vol. VI, pp. 119-41 ff.

[3] Oesterley, *Jrb. f. rom. u. eng. Lit.*, Vol. IX, p. 126.

[4] Menéndez y Pelayo, *Orígenes de la novela* (Madrid, 1905), Vol. I, pp. ciii ff.

considers the *Gatos* collection to be much better written than the *Enxenplos* or any similar collection in Spanish with the one exception of that of Juan Manuel. As with Amador de los Ríos, what impresses him in the *Gatos* is its satiric element.

> Lo que importa menos es el apólogo, que á veces no pasa de una ligera comparación ó semejanza, sino la sátira enconada, acerba, feroz, que recuerda el espíritu y aun los procedimientos del Roman de Renart en sus últimas formas. Esta sátira, no blanda y chistosa como la del Archipreste, sino armada de fuego y disciplinas, recae sobre las más elevadas condiciones sociales: sobre los magnates y ricos hombres tiranos, robadores y opresores de los pobres; sobre la corrupción y venalidad de los alcaldes y merinos reales, pero muy especialmente sobre los vicios de la clerecía secular y regular.

THE PRESENT EDITION

In the present edition I have striven to give an accurate and intelligible text of *El libro de los gatos*. All important deviations from the manuscript have been indicated in the variants, so that the accuracy of my reconstructions can easily be controlled. Insertions in the text are inclosed in brackets. Words and phrases which I have rejected are placed in the variants, although in the case of some of the fables reprinted from *El espejo de los legos*, I inclose the rejected readings in parentheses. In order not to expand unduly the variants, I have not indicated such minor errors as the failure on the part of the scribe to write a cedilla or a tilde, except in those cases where my interpretation of the text may be open to criticism. While most careful to preserve the Old Spanish orthography, I have not attempted to reproduce the various methods of writing the letter *s*. The doubling of *s*, I have, however, indicated, although it is often extremely difficult to decide whether or not the *s* is doubled in the manuscript. I transcribe *i* or *j* consonant by *j*; *i* or *j* vowel by *i*. The signs of the conjunction ⁊, *E*, and *e*, I transcribe always *e*. The abbreviation for the word *man*, I resolve always *onbre*, that being the orthography when no abbreviation is employed. The punctuation and capitalization are for the most part my own; there is little of either in the original.

(*fol. 161r*)

Aqui comiença el libro delos gatos e cuenta luego un enxienplo delo que acaesçio entre el galapago e el aguilla.

I

El galapago seyendo enllos lugares del mar fondos rrogo al aguilla que lo sobiesse al alto, ca deseaua ver los campos e llas montañas. El aguilla otorgo quanto el galapago demandaua e subiolo muy alto e dixole: Vees agora lo que cobdiçiaste ver, montes e ualles? E dixo el galapago: Pagome que lo veo. Mas querria estar en mi forado enla arçilla. E rrespondio el aguilla: Cunple auer uisto lo que cobdiçiaste. E dexolo caer en manera que fue todo quebrantado.

El galapago se entiende en algunos onbres que son pobres lazadros en este mundo o por auentura que han asaz segun su estado mas non se tienen por contentos conello e desean sobir en alto e bolar en alto enel ayre. E rruegan al diablo que llos suba en alto en qualquier manera, ansi que por derecho o por tuerto o con grandes falssedades, por fechizos o por trayçiones o por otras artes mallas, algunas vezes façellos sobir el diablo e subellos muy alto. E despues quando ellos entienden que su estado es muy peligrosso cobdiçian estar enel estado de antes, donde pidieron. Estonçe el diablo e dexalos caer enla muerte. E despues caen

The first two lines of each story are usually indented to afford space for future illumination. As usual where this has been done, the first letter is written small and faint and separate from the rest of the word.—10. e. lo a. e bolan (*lo* written by another hand and with different ink).

Herlet, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der äsopischen Fabel im Mittelalter* (Bamberg, 1892), pp. 37–44.

Chauvin, *Bibliographie des ouvrages arabes*, Vol. II, p. 90.

Kalila et Digna (ed. Allen, Macon, 1906), pp. 49 ff.

Title. *aguilla.* The constant interchange of *l* and *ll* in this text in all positions is its most striking linguistic peculiarity. For this interchange, most commonly found in Leonese documents, cf. Morel-Fatio, *Rom.*, Vol. IV, pp. 31–33; Gessner, *Zschr. f. rom. Phil.*, Vol. XVII, p. 4; J. Leite de Vasconcellos, "Philologia mirandesa," *Rev. Hisp.*, Vol. VI, p. 411; Menéndez Pidal, *El dialecto leonés* (Madrid, 1906), pp. 31 f.

1. *del mar* is possibly a faulty translation. Latin: *Tortuca manens in locis hu[mi]dis et profundis.* The Corpus Christi MS 441 is the one cited in these notes unless it be otherwise indicated.

2. *al alto.* For the use of the masculine article with the adjective where the neuter is now used cf. Cuervo, *Notas* (Paris, 1898), p. 47; Tobler, *Vermischte Beiträge*, Vol. II (Leipzig, 1894), p. 184.

8. *entiende en.* The one instance our MS affords of *en* as complement of *entenderse.* The almost invariable complement is *por.* In XI, l. 33, *a* is used three times. Where an infinitive follows, e. g., XXIV, l. 85 or a clause, XXIII, l. 18, the prepositional complement is omitted.

10. For this use of *conello*, cf. Gessner, "Der spanische Personal-Pronomen," *Zschr. f. rom. Phil.*, Vol. XVII, p. 13.

en alto enel ayre may need emendation. Latin: *super pennas uentorum. Alas* may have been confused with *alto* in an early Spanish version.

16. For this use of *e*, cf. Meyer-Lübke, *Gram.*, Vol. III, §653. Cf. III, l. 1.

enel infierno do todos son quebrantados si se non arrepienten de antes dela muerte.

Ansi, qui suben por escallera de pecados
he caen en mal lugar de sus grados.

19. anfi q.—20. m. l. mal de su grado.

17. *si se non arrepienten.* For other examples, cf. XXV, l. 95; LI, l. 16; and LIV, l. 27. For the subject of interpolation between the object pronoun and its verb, cf. Chenery, *Publications Mod. Lang. Ass. of America*, Vol. XX, pp. 1 ff.

For *de antes* as equivalent to *antes*, cf. Cuervo, *Diccionario*, *s. v.*

19, 20. These lines translate the Latin:

Sic [est] qui [stultus] scandit pernicibus alis;
Incidit a scalis in loca plena malis.

For a similar mediaeval proverb, cf. the following from the *Proverbia Heinrici* (ed. Müllenhoff und Scherer, *Denkmäler*, Berlin, 1892), Vol. I, p. 65. *Qui petit alta nimis, retrolapsus ponitur imis.* Cf. also Vol. II, p. 147, for a very complete account of this and related proverbs. The words in brackets have been supplied by Hervieux in the Corpus Christi text from other MSS. Observe the agreement of the *Gatos* with the Corpus Christi. For *e* in the conclusion, cf. Tobler, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 54; also Meyer-Lübke, *op. cit.*, §652. Suchier, *Denkm. prov. Lit.*, Vol. I (Halle, 1883), p. 510, gives useful references to other treatments of the subject. Other examples in the text: XVI, l. 17; XXIV, l. 8; XXV, l. 29; XXXII, l. 19.

II

ENXIENPLO DEL LOBO CONLA ÇIGUEÑA (*fol. 161v*)

Vn lobo atrauesosele hun hueso enla garganta e queriase afogar. E sus onbres fueron ha buscar el phisico e acordaron entresi que non auia phisico que le podiese dar mejor consejo que la çigueña que auia el pescueço luengo que le podria mejor sacar el hueso. E fueronla a buscar e fallaronla. E desque la ouieron falado dixeronla: Amiga, nuestro señor el lobo tiene vn huesso atrauesado enla garganta. Rrogamoste alla llegar. E prometieronla que la farian mucho bien. Ella fue alla e sacole el hueso al lobo. E desque gelo ouo sacado, dixoles que le diesen lo que le auian prometido. E dixo el lobo: Non te daran nada, ca asaz te deurias de tener por contenta del bien que te fiçe quando te tenia la cabeça enla garganta e te la podiera comer si quisiera.

Ansi acaesçe algunas vegadas allos labradores o alos onbres que siruen allos señores. Quando les piden que les fagan merçet porel seruiçio que les han fecho, rresponden luego los señores: Asaz te fago de bien quando non te fago quanto mal podria façer. O commo otros señores diçen asus

Herlet, *op. cit.*, pp. 16, 19.
Chauvin, *op. cit.*, Vol. III, p. 69.
Juan Ruiz (ed. Ducamin, Toulouse, 1901), p. 47.

1. For similar examples of anacoluthon, cf. XI, ll. 8, 37; XXXII, ll. 5, 11; LVII, l. 26; LVIII, l. 1. It would be easy to avoid anacoluthon in these cases by making the noun an indirect object, but cf. Nyrop, *Rom.*, Vol. XVIII, p. 502.

2. *Onbres* is thus used with reference to animals in XV, l. 11, and XXXIV, l. 2.

3. Latin: *Ciconia habet longum rostrum et poterit os a guttere extrahere.* This would seem to point to *e* rather than *que*.

14. This abrupt change from the plural to singular occurs in the Latin as well, where, however, the treatment is less awkward.

uassallos que: Te dexo veuir que bien te podria matar si quisiese. Otrosi diçen allos onbres que les siruen quando diçen que les fagan merçet: Asaz uos fago quando uos fago el bien que puedo. Si desto non uos pagades, yd buscar otra vida. Non paran mientes en commo han seruido diez o ueynte años, lleuando muchas mallas noches e muchos mallos dias por los seruir o puesto muchas vezes el cuerpo (*fol. 162r*) a peligro de muerte porellos. E quando les demandan que les fagan merçet, diçen que lla vaya[n] buscar a otra parte e an de fincar alli conel. E quando non lles dan lo que han menester, anllo de tomar o anllo de furtar. E quanto pecado ellos façen, todo es por culpa del señor.

16. T. podria d.—23. q. llo v.

16. For *que* indicating a transition from indirect to direct discourse, cf. Tobler, *Beiträge*, Vol. I (Leipzig, 1902), p. 264; Weigert, *Untersuchungen zur spanischen Syntax* (Berlin, 1907), pp. 216 ff. For other examples, see the text: XXV, l. 15; LI, l. 3.

III

Enxienplo del Aue de Sant Martin

Vna aue que llaman en España el aue de Sant Martin e es ansi pequeña commo vn Ruy Señor e aquesta aue ha las piernas muy fermosas ha manera de junco. Acaesçio ansi que vn dia çerca la fiesta de Sant Martin, quando el sol sta caliente, que esta aue se echo al sol çerca vn arbol e alço las piernas e dixo: Si el çiello cayese sobre mis piernas, bien lo podria yo tener. E ella que ouo dicha esta palabra, cayo vna foja del arbol cabella. Espantosse mucho ha deshora e començo de bolar diziendo: Sant Martin, commo non acorres atu aue?

Tales son muchos en este mundo que cuidan ser muy rreçios e al tienpo del menester son fallados por flacos commo cuenta delos fijo[s] de Effrem, [que] ar[m]ado[s] delos arcos, enlla batalla boluieren las espaldas

2. v. Fui S.—10. d. afrearado d.

The source of this story is best treated by Liebrecht, *Jrb. f. rom. u. eng. Lit.*, Vol. III, p. 151 (a review of Benfey's *Pantschatantra*).

Kalila et Digna (ed. Allen), p. 156.

Title. The bird of St. Martin is some bird of the martin family (*Hirundinidae*), possibly the ringtail (*Circus cyaneus*), called in French *l'oiseau de St. Martin;* or the king-fisher (*Alcedo ispida*), in French, *martin-pêcheur;* in Spanish, *martin pescador*. Rolland, *Faune populaire de la France* (Paris, 1879), Vol. II, p. 24, says the bird owes its name to the fact that its migratory period begins near Martinmas. Cf. Wolf, *Deutsche Mythologie* (Göttingen, 1852), Vol. I, pp. 52 f.; for another explanation of the name; cf. also Grimm, *Deutsche Mythologie* (Berlin, 1878), Vol. III, p. 326. Liebrecht, *loc. cit.*, gives other references.

6. Our MS wavers between agreement and non-agreement in the case of past-participles in compound tenses, an evidence that the date is prior to the sixteenth century; cf. Cuervo *Notas*, p. 67.

11. The allusion is to Ps. 77:9 (all scriptural references are to the Vulgate). Odo's version of this verse is as follows: *Filii Effrem, intendentes et mittentes arcum, conuersi sunt in die belli.* I take *armados* to be a translation of the Latin *intendentes et mittentes*, the translator striving to reproduce the general meaning rather than to make a literal translation.

e fuieron. Puede onbre esto apodar [a] algunos caballeros. Quando tienen la cabeça bien guarnida e de buen uino diçen que pellear[i]an con tres Françeses o que uençerian los mas fuertes dela tierra e despues espanto: Sant Martin, acorre atu auezilla.

Otrosi algunos que profaçan de otros que son flacos e de flacos coraçones que si ellos se uiessen [en] tal, quiça que lo seran ellos mas. Otrosi eso mesmo acaesçe a otras personas que profaçan (*fol. 162v*) dellos pecados agenos e por ventura que han ellos fechos otros talles o peores que aquellos. E aunque non los ayan fechos, non paran mientes que si dios non lo[s] guardasse que caerian ellos en otros talles pecados o peores. Mas si ellos parasen mientes la palabra que diçe nuestro Señor Ihesu Christo enel euuangelio, que veen la paja enel ojo ajeno e non la uiga lagar que esta enel suyo, mas non la ponen por obra asi commo lo mando Ihesu Christo quando dixo: Si quisieredes profaçar de otro, sacad la uiga lagar que tenedes en vuestro ojo e despues profaçad de la paja que tiene el otro enel suyo.

17. t. o q.—s. e e.—19. a. o e—23. l. uigar l.—24. n. le p.

12. Examples of the *vocal embebida* are common in this text. Cf. Tobler, *Vermischte Beiträge*, Vol. I, pp. 218-27, and Fitz-Gerald, *Versification of the Cuaderna Via* (New York, 1905), pp. 49 ff. Examples where *a* is omitted before another *a:* VII, l. 16; XV, l. 20; XVIII, l. 6; XX, l. 27; XXII, l. 3; XXV, l. 84; XXIX, l. 4; XLI, ll. 5, 32; XLII, l. 2. As the "personal *a*" is so frequently omitted at this period of the language, only indirect object examples have been chosen. Examples of the *vocal embebida* with *e* will be given in another place.

15. The Latin MSS here add in French: *O sein Martin, eide nostre (sic) oiselin.*

16. What follows is evidently a gloss, whether due to the translator or to some predecessor, I have been unable to determine. I find it in none of the available Latin versions. Its application to the story is none too good.

17. For other examples of this type of conditional sentence, cf. XXIV, l. 8, and XL, l. 12. Cf. Gessner, "Die hypothetische Periode im Spanischen," *Zschr. f. rom. Phil.*, Vol. XIV, p. 65.

22. A similar anacoluthon can be found in XXVII, l. 8.

23. *Euuangelio*—the regular orthography in this text. Numerous instances of the same spelling are to be found in the *Enxenplos* portion of the codex. Cf. Matt. 7:3-5.

IV

Enxienplo del Caçador conlas Perdiçes

Vn caçador andaua caçando perdiçes e auia malos ojos e llorauanle mucho. Dixo vna perdix alas otras: Catad que santo onbre es este! Dixo la otra perdix: Por que diçes que este onbre es santo? Rrespondio

2. C. que que s., first que erased.

Herlet, *op. cit.*, pp. 16, 21.

Chauvin, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 151.

Juan Manuel, *El Conde Lucanor* (ed. Knust, and Birch-Hirschfeld, Leipzig, 1900), pp. 55-57, 334-36.

Title. The Latin title is: *De oculis Calvi Lacrimantibus et Perdicibus.* The word *calvi* seems without sufficient motivation. It is probably a faulty reading of the Latin.

la otra: Non vees commo lora? E la otra rrespondio: E tu non vees commo nos toma?

Bien ansi es e ansi nos contessçe a muchos obispos e muchos perlados e a otros señores que paresçe que son buenos e façen grandes oraçiones con lagrimas, matando alos sus subjetos. E tomanles lo que han a sinrreçon. Maldichas sean las lagrimas e las oraçiones delos tales.

4. For *e* introducing a question, cf. Diez, *Gram.*, Vol. III, pp. 1059 f.

7. For *que* as a relative conjunction, cf. Diez, *Gram.*, Vol. III, pp. 1940 ff., and Gessner, "Der spanische Relativ- und Interrogativ-pronomen," *Zschr. f. rom. Phil.*, Vol. XVIII, p. 489.

9. For other instances of this orthography of *razón*, cf. VI, l. 3, and XI, l. 36. The change of *a* to *e* is due to the influence of the *r*. Cf. Pidal, *Gramática Histórica Española* (Madrid, 1905), § 17, 4. Instances of the orthography *rreçon* abound in the *Enxenplos* portion of the codex. In Enxenplo CCLXXXI (Gayangos' numbering), occurs the form *Rizon*, a development parallel to that of *rancon*, *rencon*, *rincón*, mentioned by Pidal. Instances of the same change of *a* to *e* are afforded by the forms *perrocha* and *perrochanos*, XVI, ll. 8 and 15. The form *anser*, XV, l. 9, is probably attributable to the Latin, as Odo uses the forms *anserem*. *ansere*. Similarly the form *Galter*, occurring six times in XXIV by the side of *Galtar*, may be explained by the Latin *Gualterius* of the original. The form *tres* for *tras*. LIX, l. 10, is another interesting example.

Forms like *bendicho*, *maldicho*, *bendito*, *maldito*, occur side by side. The weak past-participles of these verbs nowhere appear.

V

Enxienplo del Aue que quebranta Huessos

Es vn aue que laman quebranta huessos e llamanlla ansi porque los quebranta e despues que los ha quebrantados, come la caña que falla dentro. (*fol. 163r.*) E quando falla algun hueso mui fuerte que non lo puede quebrantar, subelo mui alto e despues dexalo caer en alguna peña en guisa que se quebranta todo.

Bien ansi conteçe que façe el diablo. Quando alguno non puede quebrantar por pecado, estonçe subelo en alguna dignidat alta. E desque se alli vee, façe algunos pecados. Estonçe lo dexa el diablo caer en manera que todo se quebranta.

Otrossi algunos grandes señores o algunos otros onbres que estan en grand estado, que quiça si non estuuiesen en tan grand onrra, non caerian en tantos pecados commo caen nin farian tanto mal commo façen. E despues por sus pecados caen enel infierno do son todos quebrantados. E quanto el estado mayor es, tanto estan ellos en mayor peligro, saluo algunos aquien dios quiere dar graçia que fagan el bien que pueden e que

3. dentro repeated. — q. fallan a. — 4. l. puden q. — 11. e. entro g.

Title. Besides the Latin *frangensos*, the MSS give the Old French *freinos*.

11. For *que*, cf. Tobler, *op. cit.*, art. 36.

se guarden de pecado. Ca quanto de mas alto cae la piedra, tanto se fiere. Porque ansi llos malos obispos o los malos señores mas a fondon caen del infierno que non los pobres.

16. The two Latin proverbs translated here are in Odo: *quanto gradus alcior, tanto casus grauior. Profundius cadit lapis ab alto quam ab imo.* Hervieux remarks of the first: Claudien avait dit: *Tolluntur in altum ut lapsu graviore ruant.* Knust points out the following from the *Enxemplos* (ed. Gayangos), p. 503: *Cuanto mas subes mas bajo descenderás.* For the best collection of this proverb's variants in the different literatures, cf. Reinsberg-Düringsfeld, *Sprichwörter d. ger. u. rom. Sprachen*, Vol. I (Leipzig, 1872), § 739. Cf. note to proverb I.

VI

ENXIENPLO DEL EREJE CONLA MOSCA

Cuenta que en tierra de Tollossa vn ereje predico en plaça delante todo el pueblo e dixo que dios verdadero non fiçiera todo el mundo nin las bestias nin las aues nin los cuerpos que enel eran. E la rreçon por que el llo deçia era esta: que non podria ser [que] dios tan noble e tan verdadero que fiçiese tan lixosa animalia commo la mosca. Estonçe vino vna mosca con grand rroydo para lo ferir enel rrostro e el defendiose conla (*fol. 163v*) mano della e ella passose del otro cabo, e asentosele enel rrostro. El tirola otra vez e quando la tiraua de vn cabo, pasauasele del otro. Tanto porfiaua en esta manera que lo ouo ella de morder en tal manera que cayo el en tierra amorteçido. Ansi la mosca prouo mui bien que dios la fiçiera.

1. e. el qual p. — 3. q. enellos e. — 5. laxosa — 9. q. la o.

1. Toulouse was the home of heresy *par excellence* during the thirteenth century. Whether we agree with Voigt that these fables were written between the years 1198–1209, or accept Hervieux's opinion that they were written between 1219–21, it is certain that Odo wrote his fables during the controversy between the church and the Albigenses.

el qual could be retained with the insertion of *era* or *auia* after *Tollossa*, but I have chosen to make my correction conform to the Latin.

Latin: *in loco exaltado predicauit.* The free rendering given these words by the translator leaves the heretic's death insufficiently explained.

5. I have been unable to find another instance of the orthography, *laxosa*.

VII

ENXIENPLO DEL BUFO CONLA LIEBRE

Acaesçio vna vegada que todas las animalias feçieron cabildo entresi que enbiasen vna animalia de cada casa. El bufo enbio a su fijo alla. E su fijo quando se yua, oluido los çapatos nueuos que tenia. El bufo penso ensu coraçon, que qual animalia podria ser mas lijera que gelos podiese lleuar para aquel dia del cabildo, porque su fijo pudiesse andar apostado. E paresçiole que la liebre corria mas que llas otras animalias

2. e. v(s, erased)na a. d. c. cosa — s. fija a.

Herlet, *op. cit.*, p. 34.

e llamola e puso conella que lleuase los çapatos asu fijo e el que gelo pagaria bien. E dixo ella: Yo façerlo he de mui buena mente. Amuestrame commo lo pueda conosçer entre tantas animalias commo alli se ayuntaran. El bufo respondio: Aquel que tu uieres mas fermoso entre todos los otros, aquel es el mi fijo. Estonçe le dixo la liebre: Pues [es] la paloma o es [el] pauon. Rrespondio estonçe el bufo e dixo: Ay, que nin es el vno nin el otro, ca la paloma ha las carnes blandas e el pauon los pies feos. Estonçe dixo la liebre: Pues muestrame en que manera conosçere al tu fijo. Aquel que ha tal cabeça commo yo e tal uientre e tales piernas e tales pies (*fol. 164r*), aquel es mi fijo fermoso e [a] aquel da tu los çapatos nueuos. La liebre fuese luego para el cabildo conllos çapatos e dixo al lleon e allas otras animalias de commo el bufo mandara saludar aquel entre todas las otras animalias. E dixo entonçe el leon: Qui sapo ama, luna le paresçe. E si alguno ama la rrana, aquella le paresçe rreyna.

Ansi ac[a]esçe a muchos onbres e de buenas personas e non se quieren allegar sinon allos beodos [e] allos thaures e allos ladrones e aquellos paresçe aellos que son buenos e los mejores porque han talles condiçiones commo ellos e paresçe aellos que son aquellos los mejores ansi commo paresçio al bufo que su fijo era el mas fermoso de todas las animalias. Ca diçe Sant Augustin: Non quieras ser loado delos malos sinon delos buenos. Ca si aquellos te loaren, non puede ser que algunas de aquelas condiçiones non aya enti.

7. e gue g.—16. e aguel d.—19. sopo—26. m. nin d.—28. conditiones.

7. *puso conella*, i. e., "arranged with her."
8. *amuestra;* modern, *muestra.*
10. *mas fermoso.* Cf. Diez, *Gram.*, Vol. III, p. 770.
12. *Ay, que;* cf. Tobler, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 61.
13. Latin: *Columba habet nigras carnes.* Is *blandas* a corruption of *blancas?*
18. Latin: *Bufo pre ceteris filium suum commendauit. Mandara saludar* is an incorrect translation. *Commendare* did mean "command" during the Middle Ages (cf. Du Cange, *Gloss., s. v.*), but here it should plainly have been translated "commend."
19. This proverb is given in French in the Corpus Christi MS: *Ki Crapout eime, Lune li semble.* The second proverb is in Latin: *Si quis amat Ranam, putat esse Dianam.* Voigt, *op. cit.*, p. 114, mentions several places where the first of these two proverbs is found. I may add that the variant he quotes from Cod. S. Omer 115: *Dilige bufonem, pulchrum similabit Adonem*, is also to be found in the "Scheftlarer Sprüchen," *Zschr. f. deut. Alt.*, Vol. XXX, p. 272. The second, for which Voigt gives no parallel, may be found in the *Proverbia Heinrici* (ed. Müllenhoff and Scherer, *op. cit.*), Vol. I, chap. xxvii. In the notes, Vol. II, p. 150, many other parallels are noted. Cf. also Reinsberg-Düringsfeld (there referred to) *Sprichwörter*, Vol. II, § 323. Le Roux de Lincy, *Le livre des proverbes français*, Vol. I (Paris, 1859), p. 174. Odo's direct source for this and many other proverbs was probably the *Proverbia Magistri Serlonis.* Magister Serlo or Serlo magister Parisiensis was a Cistercian monk of the twelfth century. Odo relates an anecdote about him in his sermons, Hervieux, *op. cit.*, Vol. IV, p. 341. Another possible allusion may be found, *ibid.*, p. 268. Serlo's proverbs have been published by Meyer, *Archives des missions scientifiques* (Paris, 1868), pp. 172 ff. The proverb is there given in the following forms: *Ki crapoud aime, lune li semble. Buffonem cura? fiet, te judice, luna. Buffo curetur? jam buffo luna videtur. Sit buffo carus? fiet luna mage clarus. Sit buffo quod amas? hunc lunam vincere clamas.*
20. *rreyna* of course does not translate *Dianam.* A desire for alliteration is probably back of the translator's choice of the word.
21. What follows is not found in Odo.
22. *thaures* is the same as *tahures, tafures.* For another orthography, cf. Juan Ruiz, *Libro de buen amor* (ed. Ducamin), p. 308, where MS S (the Leonese MS) gives the form *thafur;* MS T, *tahur.*

VIII

ENXIEMPLO DEL MANCEBO QUE AMAVA LA VIEJA

Vn mançebo amaua vna uieja e deçia algunas vezes commo [non] se podria partir de aquella vieja que tanto amaua. E dixole vn: Mesquino, commo eres loco que amas tanto aesta uieja e muger tan fea! E el rrespondio: Mui fermosa me paresçe.

Ansi acaesçe algunas vegadas que algunos onbres tienen fermosas mugeres e paganse de otras que son muy mas feas. Onde diçe Sant Augustin que esto se entiende por el anima del pecador que es esposa de Ihesu Christo e se paga algunas (*fol. 164v*) veçes mas de furtar e deçir vn falso testimonio o de façer adulterio o de façer los siete pecados mortales que non de amar a dios nin de guardase de pecado. La tal persona commo esta es conparada al bufo que ama asu fijo e le paresçio mas fermoso que ninguna animalia. E estos tales aman mas al diablo porque les paresçe ensus obras mas que non façen a dios que los crio nin alos sus santos. Ay, que gran çegedad e que gran yerro e engaño! E por esto, señor dios, alunbra los nuestros ojos que te cognoscamos por mas fermoso e danos entendimiento porque te amemos sobre toda cosa. Onde diçe Sant Augustin: Señor, tu feçiste todas las cosas. Aquien tu paresçes formoso, todas las cosas le paresçen fermossas. E aquien tu paresçes bueno, todas las cosas le son buenas. E aquellos son bien aventurados que creen que tu eres bien conplido e bien acabado que ninguna cosa sinti non les es buena nin les paresçe bien.

10. d. amor a — 20. erees.

1. My emendation is not justified by the Latin: *Querebat consilium qualiter possit ab amore ipsius separari.* This, however, hardly seems to be correct.

5. In the Latin, it is the woman who is represented as scorning a handsome husband in favor of an ugly lover. This makes more apt the comparison with the *esposa de Ihesu Christo.*

7. This similitude is not ascribed to Augustine in the Latin.

10. *guadase.* Cf. Pidal, *Gram.*, § 94, 5; also Cornu, "Études sur le poème du Cid," *Rom.*, Vol. X, p. 89. For another example in the text, cf. LVII, 16.

17. The quotation, very much garbled in the Spanish, is from Augustine's *Confessiones*, Bk. XI, chap. iv: *Tu ergo, domine, fecisti ea, qui pulcher es; pulchra sunt enim; qui bonus es: bona sunt enim; qui es: sunt enim. Nec ita pulchra sunt nec ita bona sunt nec ita sunt, sicut tu conditor eorum, quo conparato nec pulchra sunt nec bona sunt nec sunt.*

IX

ENXIENPLO DEL GATO CONEL MUR

En vn monesterio auia vn gato que auia muerto todos los mures del monesterio saluo vno que era muy grand el qual non podia tomar. Pensso el gato ensu coraçon en que manera lo podria engañar que lo

Herlet, *op. cit.*, pp. 25, 26.

2. The apocopated forms *grand*, *gran* are often used where the full form is required in modern Spanish: XI, l. 19; XV, l. 25 (not a sure instance); l. 26; XXIV, l. 57. Possibly *vn* for *vno*, VIII, l. 2 is something similar.

podiese matar. E tanto pensso enello que acordo entresi que se fiçiese façer la corona e que se uistiese abito de monje e que se asentase conlos monjes ala messa, [e] estonçe que auria derecho del mur. E fiçolo ansi commo (*fol. 165r*) lo auia pensado. El mur desque uio el gato comer conlos monjes ouo mui gran plaçer e cuido pues el gato era entrado en rreligion que dende adelante que le non faria enojo ninguno, en tal manera que se uino don mur ado los monjes estauan comiendo e començo a saltar aca e alla. Estonçe el gato boluio los ojos commo aquel [que] non tenia ojo a vanidad nin locura ninguna. E paro el rrostro muy acuerdo e mui omildoso. E el mur desque vio aquello, fuese llegando poco a poco e el gato desque lo vio cabesi, echo las vñas enel mui fuerte mente e començo lo apertar muy fuerte mente la garganta. E dixo el mur: Por que me façes tan grand crueldad que me quieres matar siendo monje? Estonçe dixo el gato: Non prediques agora tanto por [que] yo te dexe, ca ermano, sepas que quando me pago so monje e quando me pago soy calonje e por esto fago asy esto.

Ansi es de muchos clerigos e de muchos ordenados en este mundo que non pueden auer rriqueças nin dignidades nin aquello que cobdiçian auer. Estonçe ayvnan e rrezan, ca fiñense de buenos e de santos [e] en sus coraçones son muy falsos e muy cobdiçiosos e muy amygos del diablo e façense paresçer al mundo tales commo angeles. E otros que se meten ser monjes, por tal que les fagan priores e obispos, e por esto façense corona e uistense abitos porque puedan tomar alguna dignidad asi commo tomo el gato al mur. E maguera entiendan despues que lo han auido falsa mente, por mucho que los otro[s] prediquen que lo dexen, [non lo quieren dexar]. (*fol. 165v*)

En esta manera el araña filla sus tellas e, ordida su tella, consumese toda por tomar vna mosca e despues que lla ha tomada viene vn uiento e lleua la tella e la araña e la mosca.

Ansi es de muchos clerigos escolares que uan alla corte, a vezes des-

7. commo repeated—12. o. e v.—E para e.—13. aquella—20. A. son d.—22. ay vna erreza ca finense—30. en repeated.

6. Probable instances of *vocal embebida* before *e:* l. 22; XII, l. 1; XIII, l. 2; XXIV, l. 12; XXV, l. 56; XLII, l. 3; XLIII, l. 5; LIX, l. 6.

15. It is impossible to say whether the preposition *a* has been lost before *apertar* by reason of *vocal embebida* or whether this is an instance of *començar* governing the infinitive directly without prepositional complement. Cf. XXXVII, l. 18 and LVII, l. 22.

Examples of *lo*, *los*, as indirect object: XV, 44, XXI, l. 3; XXIII, l. 12; XXIV, l. 80; XXXII, l. 3; XXXIV, l. 10; LI, l. 2; LV, l. 8.

18. *sepas*. Cf. Cuervo, *Notas*, p. 94.

In the first person, singular, present indicative of *ser*, *estar*, *dar*, and *ir*, this text contains six instances of forms ending in *y* and ten without. Examples in addition to the two occurring in this line: XI, l. 22; XIV, l. 4; XX, ll. 9, 11; XXV, l. 29; XXXVI, l. 2; LI, l. 6; LIV, ll. 4, 5, 7^2, 8^2, 9.

22. The forms *enfinnir*, *enfiñir*, occur in the *Fuero Juzgo* (ed. Real Acad. Esp., Madrid, 1815). Cf. glossary *s. v.* Latin: *ieiunant*, *fingunt se bonos et sanctos*, etc. Gayangos arbitrarily alters the reading to: *facen una herejia*.

nudos e con grandes calenturas e frios e nieues, por muchos montes, por valles e trabajando mucho, quebrantando sus carnes e sus cuerpos por cobrar algun beneficio. E despues viene la muerte e lieualo todo.

X

ENXIENPLO DELA[S] PROPRIEDADES DELAS MOSCAS

Deuedes saber que son muchas maneras de moscas. Ay vnas moscas que fieren muy mal e son muy acuçiosas por façer mal e otras que ensuçian e otras que façen grand rroydo. La mosca que muerde se entiende por algunos clerigos que han beneficios enllas iglesias e mantienense con ello commo avarientos e non lo quieren dar allos pobres, antes allegan dineros. E todo su cuydado e todo su entendimiento es puesto en tomar dineros de sus clerigos e en allegar gran thessoro commoquier que ellos tienen asaz delo suyo. Aquestos tales son moscas que fieren. Otrosi que [otros] son que viuen luxuriosa mente e tienen barraganas e fijos e expi[en]den quanto han dela iglegia en[ellos]. Aqueste es la mosca que ensuzia. Otrosi ay otras maneras de clerigos que tienen muchas conpañas e muchos escuderos (*fol. 166r*) e muchos caualleros. Aquel es semejante alla mosca que façe rruydo e apostremas viene vn gran uiento que todo lo lieua. El gran viento es la ora dela muerte que to el stado e toda la forma estruy del onbre.

2. q. se e.—5. n. la q.—10. Aquesta, the word is blotted—12. -deros repeated.

8. *otrosi que.* Cf. *Fuero de Salamanca* (ed. Ruano, Salamanca, 1870), pp. 24 f.

9. In still another place, XXXV, l. 31, we have an evident confusion between *expender* and *expedir*. The correct form, *espienden*, occurs XLI, l. 28.

14. *to.* Cf., *ibid.*, p. 29. *To* for *todo* is still to be found in almost every part of the peninsula. Cf. Pereda, *La puchera* (Madrid, 1889), p. 503.

15. *estruy.* Forms from *estruir* occur twice in this text (XLII, l. 3), while forms from *destruir* occur four times (XVII, ll. 8, 10; XX, l. 15; XLII, l. 7). Examples of *estruir* are not uncommon in the old language. They occur mostly in northern texts. Cf. Juan Ruiz, *El libro de buen amor* (ed. Ducamin), copla 400, where it occurs in the Salamanca MS only; *Poema de Alfonso Onceno* (ed. Janer), coplas 155, 770.

XI

ENXIEMPLO DELOS MURES

Vn mur que uiuia en vna casa pregunto a otro mur que uiuia enlos canpos que que era lo que comia. El rrespondio: Como duras fauas e secos granos de trigo e de ordio. E dixo el mur de casa: Amigo, muchas son tus viandas duras. Marauilla es commo non eres muerto de fanbre. E pregunto el de fuera al de casa: Pues tu, que comes? Rrespondio el de casa: Digote que como buenas viandas e buenos bocados e bien gordos, a uegadas pan blanco. Por ende rruegote que vengas ami posada e

2. r. con d.—4. muerte—6. q. commo b.

Herlet, *op. cit.*, p. 16.
Juan Ruiz, *Libro de buen amor* (ed. Ducamin), pp. 250–53.
Libro de Enxemplos (ed. Gayangos), No. CLXXVI.

comeras muy bien comigo. El mur de fuera plugule mucho e fuese conel para su casa e fallaron que stauan los onbres comiendo. E los que comian ala messa echauan migas de pan e otros bocados fuera dela messa. El mur de casa dixo al estraño: Sal del forado e veras quantos bienes caen aquellos onbres dela messa. Estonçe salio el mur estraño del forado e tomo vn bocado; e el tomando el bocado, fue el gato en pos del mur, que mal a bes [f]vyo el mur dentro enel forado e dixo el mur dela posada: Viste que buenos bocados? Muchas vegadas los como tales. E rrue[go]te que finques aqui comigo algunos dias. Rrespondio el estraño: Buenos son bocados mas dime (*fol. 166v*) si as cada dia tal conpaña. E dixo el mur dela posada: Qual? E dixo el estraño: Vn gato me afogo agora, onde tan gran fue el miedo que oue que se me cayo el bocado dela boca e ouello a dexar. Estonçe dixo el dela posada: Aquel gato que tu vees, aquel mato ami padre e ami [madre e yo] mismo muchas vezes he estado a peligro de muerte que mal a ves soy escapado de sus vñas. E dixo el estraño: Çierta mente non queria que todo el mundo fuese mio si siempre ouiese de beuir en tal peligro. E fincate contus bocados, ca mas quiero viuir en paz con pan e agua que non auer todas las rriquezas del mundo con tal conpaña commo as.

Ansi es de muchos benefiçiados en este mundo, de yglesia, que son vsureros o que façen simonia, que con tamaño[s] peligros comen los bocados mal ganados, que sobre cada bocado esta el gato que se entiende por el diablo que asecha las animas. E mas les valdria comer pan de ordio con buena conçiençia que non auer todas las rriqueças deste mundo con tal conpaño.

Otrosi esto mesmo se entiende alos rreys o alos señores o alos çibda danos onrrados cada vno ensu estado, que quieren tomar por fuerça algo desus vezinos o desus vassalos o de amigos o de enemigos en qualquier guisa que lo puedan tomar alos onbres atuerto o asynrreçon o façen otros pecados mortales. Estos tales sienpre esta el diablo cabellos para los afogar, commoquier que algunos sufre nuestro señor algunos dias cudando

14. q. mala bes vyo entrar el mur enel forado e tomo vn bocado, the last four words erased — 15. viste repeated — l. commo t.— 18. m. afogora o.— 29. e. cato q.— 38. -dando repeated.

8. *plugu*. The word stands at the end of a line in the MS. Final *u* instead of *o*, a peculiarity of the Asturian and to a lesser extent of the Leonese, occurs four times in the text. Cf. XXIV, l. 11; XXXVII, l. 8; LVII, l. 23; Pidal, *El dialecto leonés*, pp. 25 f.

11. *estraño*, modern *extranjero*.

12. For examples of *caer* used transitively, cf. Cuervo, *Dicc.*, *s. v.*

14. *a bes* translates Latin *vix*. In Old Spanish it was frequently reinforced by *mal*. Cf. Diez, *Wörterbuch*, *s. v.* The phrase was perhaps incomprehensible to our scribe as he consistently wrote it *mala bes*. Latin: *vix euasit in foramen*.

21. Latin: *patrem meum et matrem interfecit et ego multociens uix euasi*.

30. *asecha*, modern *acecha*. The Old Spanish knew both forms. Cf. Cuervo, *Dicc.*, *s. v.*

33. What follows probably does not belong to the original.

38. *cudando*. Cf. Juan Ruiz, *Libro de buen amor* (ed. Ducamin), copla 695. Rabbi Don Sem Tob, *Proverbios morales* (ed. Janer), copla 550. *Libro de Alexandre* (ed. Janer), coplas 331, 463. The form is well proved by the rhyme.

(*fol. 167r*) que se emendaran. Mas al cabo, si non se emiendan, viene el diablo e matalos e lieualos al infierno onde mas se les ualdria eneste mundo ser pobres e lazrados que non despues sofrir las penas para sienpre.

XII

ENXIENPLO DELA BESTIA ALTILOBI

Es vna bestia [que llaman] altilobi [e] es de tal natura [que] siempre ua trebejar al logar que mas espeso[s] vee los arboles e mas baxos. E tanto anda a vna parte e a otra fasta que sele rrebueluen todos los cuernos enlas rramas. Estonçes da mui grandes boçes e quando oyen las bozes, los caçadores van aella e matanla.

Ansi es de muchos onbres en este [mundo] que se ponen a forçar [o] a rrobar los caminos o matar onbres o façer otros males muchos e tanto ussan enello que despues non se pueden delo partir. Estos paresçen alas bestias que non pueden sacar los cuernos dela[s] rramas. Otrosi ay otros onbres que son semejantes aesta bestia que son thaures e beodos e garganteros que estan enbueltos en otros pecados e non se pueden partir dellos. Estonçe vienen los diablos que son caçadores delas animas delos malos e lieuanlas al infierno.

2. trabajar—l. astoles e—3. l. aterr erased c.—7. e o t.—8. p. sacar los cuerlo d.—12. d. animalias d.

Chauvin, *op cit.*, Vol. III, p. 27.

Title. *altilobi.* Modern *antílope.*

1. Latin: *Quoddam animal uocatur Antilops.*

2. Latin: *ludit cum uirgultis cum cornibus suis.* For *trebejar* (modern *jugar*, *juguetear*), cf. Berceo, *Signos que aparesçeran ante del juiçio* (ed. Janer), copla 61; *Alexandre* (ed. Janer), coplas 111, 738. I have been unable to find another instance of *astoles.* It appears to translate *uirgultis.* Can it be related to *astil*, *astilla*? I have hesitated before accepting Gayangos' emendation, *arboles.*

XIII

ENXIENPLO DEL GUSANO HYDRUS

Ay vn gusano que laman ydrus e es de tal natura que se enbuelue enel lodo [e] entra enla boca del cocodrildo quando duerme e liegale fasta el uientre e muerdele enel coraçon e ansi lo mata.

Por que deuemos entender el fijo de dios que tomo el lodo de nuestra carne (*fol. 167v*) por tal que mas lijera mente se deslauase enla boca del diablo. Ansi entro enel e mordiolo enel coraçon e matolo. Esto se

Cf. *Rom.*, Vol. I, p. 430.

---

2. The metathesis of the *r* in *cocodrildo* occurs already in the Latin *cocodrillus.*

The form *liega* is doubtless to be explained by the frequency with which the palatalized *l* sound is represented by *li.* Starting from a form like *lieua* where the *li* is phonetic, it replaces the regular *ll*, its phonetic equivalent.

4. Gayangos' insertion of *lo* after *Por* is unnecessary. Cf. Gessner, *Zschr. f. rom. Phil.*, Vol. XVIII, p. 465.

entiende, que despues que Ihesu Christo tomo muerte e pasion por lo[s] pecadores saluar, estonçe mando al ḍiablo, que despues que el morio qualquier onbre se pudiese saluar si quisiere. Otrosi por pecador que sea e por pecados que aya fechos, si se arrepentiere e se guardare dende adelante de façer mal e pidiere merçet anuestro señor que lo perdone, luego se podria saluar. Ca tanto que esto faga, luego se tirara el diablo del.

9. p. pecados q.—10. Instead of si, so was first written then corrected.

XIV

Enxienplo delo que acaesçio entrela Gulpeja e el Lobo

Acaesçio vna vegada que la gulpeja entro en una ferrada e apeso la ferrada e cayo enel poço e estaua enel poço que non podia salir dende. E vino aella el lobo e preguntole que que façia. E ella le respondio: Conpadre, bien sto aqui, que fallo vnos pescados muy grandes de comer e si aqui quijeredes entrar comigo, aueredes muy buena parte delos. Rrespondio el lobo: Comadre, commo podre yo desçender alla? Dixo la gulpeja: Alla suso esta otra ferra. Ponte dentro enella e desçindiras luego aca. En aquel poço auia dos poçales. Quando el vno sobia, el otro desçendia. El lobo entro enla ferrada que estauaençima. Commo era pessado, desçendio luego la farrada afondon del poço e la gulpeja subiose suso. E quando se encontraron en medio del poço, dixo [el lobo:] Do ys comadre? Rrespondio ella: Asaz he comido e subome suso. Mas tu desçende (*fol. 168r*) e veras marauillas. El malandante del lobo desçendio al poço e non fallo otra cosa sinon agua. E quando vino la manaña, vinieron los del aldea e fallaron el lobo enel poço e sacaronlo e dieronlo tantos de pallos que lo dexaron por muerto.

Herlet, *op. cit.*, p. 29.
Chauvin, *op. cit.*, Vol. III, p. 78.
Libro de los enxemplos (ed. Gayangos), No. CCCVII.
Köhler, *Kleinere Schriften* (ed. Bolte), Vol. II (Berlin, 1900), pp. 572 f.

5. *quijeredes.* Cf. Baist, *Gröbers Grundriss; Gram.*, § 42.

6. *Ysemgrimus* of the original is rendered *lobo.* None of the names commonly used in the animal epic is retained in our version. The same change is made in XIV and XIX. In IX and XI, *Murilegus* becomes *gato.* In XXXVII *Reinardus* and *Tabergo* become respectively *gulpeja* and *gato*, and in XLIII *Berengarius* becomes *oso.* This is interesting as showing how little the animal epic was known in Spain.

7. *ferra* for *ferrada* represents the same disappearance of intervocalic *d* already noticed in X. Cf. *ca* for *cada*, Pereda, *La Puchera* (Madrid, 1880), p. 550. Cf. *uega* for *uegada*, XXXI, l. 1. We must not conclude from the orthography *desçindiras* that we are dealing with an instance of a shifting from the second to the third conjugation. It is probably merely another instance of the common weakening of *e* to *i* in atonic syllables.

12. *ys.* Other droppings of the *d* in the second person plural: XXV, ll. 8, 44, 53, 97, 99. There are twenty cases in the *Gatos* where the second person plural is used, and in only six cases has the *d* been dropped. The form *ydes* occurs XXV, l. 43. Cf. Cuervo, "Las segundas personas de plural en la conjugación castellana," *Rom.*, Vol. XXII, pp. 71 ff.; *Notas*, p. 91; Pidal, *Gram.*, p. 107, 1.

13. Another failure to diphthongize the *e* may be found in XLVIII, l. 26. Cf. Pidal, *El dialecto leonés* (Madrid, 1906), p. 17.

La gulpeja significa el diablo que diçe al onbre: Desçiende aca ami enel pecado. Falaras rriquezas e muchos bienes. E los locos creenlo e fazen los pecados que le[s] pone el diablo enel coraçon e desque los han fechos, non fallan bien enellos de que se puedan aprouechar. Ansi que vienen los enemigos e sacan al pecador del poço atormentandolo.

19. p. gue l.—20. f. nin f.

XV

ENXIENPLO DEL LEON E EL LOBO E LLA GULPEJA

El leon e el lobo e la gulpeja posieron su postura en vno a caçar e quanto caçasen que lo traxiesen e que lo comiesen en vno. El leon traxo un buey muy grueso e el lobo vn carnero muy bueno e la gulpeja vn ansar. E uinieron comerlo todo en vno e dixo el leon al lobo: Partid vos esta carne. E dixo el lobo: Paresçeme que seria bueno que coma cada vno lo que caço; el [leon] su vaca, yo mi carnero, la gulpeja su ansar. El leon ensañose mucho delo e alço las manos e las vñas e dio conello enel rrostro al lobo e desologelo todo. Dixo la gulpeja al leon: Señor, vos come[rede]s del anser y el carnero que son dos uiandas muy saborosas e otrosi comeredes del buey quanto fuere la vuestra merçet e lo que fincare comeremos nos, ca vuestros onbres somos. E dixo estonçe el leon: Çierta miente bien diçes mas rruegote que me digas quien te amostro tan bien fablar. E estonçe le rrespondio la gulpeja: El rrostro demy (*fol. 168v*) conpañero que esta todo desolado.

Ansi nuestro señor castigo anuestro padre Adam por el pecado que fizo quando fue desobediente, por fanbre e por set e por mengua de vestir e despues por muerte. Ca sy Adam non pecara, nos non morieramos nunca. Ca en cuerpo e en anima nos fueramos a parayso e nunca pecaramos eneste mundo nin nunca ouieramos fanbre nin set nin frio nin calentura. E pues aquel castigo que dio [a] Adam nos diuiera anos dar, que nunca fiçiesemos cosa que despluguiese a dios. E algunas vezes quando castiga el nuestro [señor] algunos con pestillençia, algunos locos son a vezes mas cuerdos porello.

E algunas vezes quando ay algun leon brauo, el onbre que lo guarda fiere delante del gran al leonçilo, chico, por tal que el leon grand se amanse mas. Mas se deuria amansar el leonçilo chiquelo, si uiese ferir al grand.

Dios nuestro señor castigo tres leones, por tal que nos mesquinos

9. c. gue s.—10. quando.—16. vestiz—17. n. fueramos nunca morieramos —25. d. del al gran leonçilo chico p.

Herlet, *op. cit.*, p. 29.
Chauvin, *op. cit.*, Vol. III, p. 67.

---

9. Latin: *uos comedatis*, etc.
22. Prov. 19:25: *Pestilente flagellato stultus sapientior erit.* Also Prov. 21:11.

leonçilos ayamos miedo e nos guardemos de pecar. Ca el castigo a Satanas, que lo echo del çielo al infierno, e el castigo Adam el primero padre. Otrosi fizo sofrir mucho[s] tormentos ala carne de Ihesu Christo que fue su fijo. Onde la palabra que dixo Ihesu Christo asu padre fue tal: Enmi pasaron las tus yras. Esto dixo el porque lo paso alos tormentos dela cruz e delos clauos e non lo quiso perdonar dela muerte. Esto fizo el, lo vno por nos rredemir e lo al porque tomemos nos enxienplo, que pues el sufriera tantas penas por nos, que era lo que deuiamos de sofrir por el. E nos mesqui[nos] aun por todo esto non auemos miedo e nuestro señor pue deçir: Mas ayna castigo yo las (*fol. 169r*) bestias fieras que non aty. Maldichos de tales leonçilos que, siendo feridos e llagados tan grandes leones non se quieren emendar nin castigar.

Aun en otra manera se puede entender esto del leon e del lobo e dela gulpeja: que ay algunos señores que son tan brauos como leones e façen muchas cosas que non son de façer nin las deuian ellos de façer. Si alguno ay que les diga la verdad, desuella[n]lo e castiga[n]lo ansi commo castigo e desolo el leon al lobo. Ca o lo mata[n] o lo toma[n] lo que ha [con] saña porello. Ansi que los otros que lo veen non osan dezir nada commo la gulpeja. E diçen muchas lisonjas, que han miedo que los castigue ansi como castiguo alos otros.

32. E. pasequio l. t. yeruas—35. afterpues is a cross much like the ordinary abbreviation for ver—38. q. s. f. repeated—40. p. e. e e.

29. *Adam el primero padre* is probably a mistaken translation. Latin: *uerberauit primum Adam, uerberauit secundum Adam, id est Christus.*

32. Ps. 87:17: *In me transierunt irae tuae.*

37. As to *pue* for *puede*, cf. *Disticha Catonis* (ed. Pietsch, Chicago, 1902), p. 15, n. I have hesitated as to the advisability of emending this passage. It is wrong as it stands. The Latin has it: *Micius inueni quam te gen*[*us*] *ferarum*, a verse which I have been unable to locate. I have let the Spanish stand, thinking the mistake more likely to have occurred in the Latin. *Micius* could have been changed to *cicius*, which would give *mas ayna.*

40. What follows did not originate with Odo.

An interesting hitherto inedited Old Spanish variant of this story is found in the translation of Hoveden's, *Speculum Laicum*, the *Espejo de los legos*, Biblioteca Nacional, MS 117:

El leon e el lobo e la gulpeja andauan a caçar e tomaron vna vaca e vna oueja e vna ansar. E commo fuese hora de partir, dixo el leon al lobo: Don lobo, partid la nuestra prea. Dixo el lobo: Leon señor, porque tu eres rey e señor nuestro, tu tomaras la vaca e yo que so menor que tu e mas mayor que la gulpeja tomare el oueja, e la gulpeja tomara el ansar. E el leon desque esto vio estendio el pie contra el lobo e colas vñas leuole todo el cuero dela cabeça e finco conla cabeça sangrienta. E dixo ala (ala) gulpeja: Parte tu. E dixo la gulpeja: Señor, porque eres rrey e señor, tu aueras la vaca, e mi señora la leona tu (tu) muger aura la oueja. e aquellos tus fijos mis señores aueran el ansar. Ala qual el leon dixo: Dime gulpeja, quien te mostro tan sabia mente partir? Al qual la gulpeja dixo: Señor, este mi conpañero consu cabeça bermeja. E demostrole el lobo. Tal conpañia es commo la del leon, conuiene saber, quando el vno lo ha todo e el otro nada, assi que el uno ha fambre e el otro esta farto. Contra la qual cosa es Seneca, el qual dize a Lucillo enla epistola xlviii: Esa misma cosa conuiene ami que ati o non so yo tu amigo. La amistança faze la conpañia entrenos. Ca alguna cosa dela buena ventura nin del contriçio non es a cada vno singular.

Ad Lucilium Epis. Mor., Bk. V, epis. vii, or, numbering the epistles from the beginning, Epis. xlviii, as correctly stated in the text: *Mihi vero idem expedit, quod tibi aut non sum amicus.*

XVI

ENXIENPLO DEL MUR QUE COMIO EL QUESSO

Vn onbre tenia quesso enel arca e entro vn mur dentro e començó a comer del quesso. El onbre penso en commo podria façer que el mur non comiese el quesso e ouo por consejo que posiese dentro enel arca el gato e fiçolo ansi. E desque lo uio el gato dentro, mato el mur e comio el quesso.

Ansi façen muchos onbres que pornan vna iglesia en mano de vn capellan que gastara todos los bienes dela. E despues quando sse querelan del al obispo, porna y otro peor que gastara la perrocha. El capelan que [come la perrocha] se entiende por el quesso [e] el mur. Otrosi muchas vezes [acaesçe] que ponen los obispos algunos curas que non son letrados e non entienden que cosa son pecados, antes ay enellos muchas mallas condiçiones. Estos tales nunca amonestan el pueblo. En lugar (*fol. 169v*) de aprender delos, buenos enxienplos, aprenden los malos en guisa que los sus subjetos stan en mal stado e ellos en peor, ansi que uiene el diablo que se entiende por el gato e lieua el cura e los perrochanos.

E otrosi se entiende por muchos señores que les dizen que ensu pueblo non passan aderecho. El[los] en lugar delos façer enmendar, e ponenles vn alcalde e vn merino, non quales elos han menester mas aquellos que quiere[n] façer merçet o han buena voluntad e aquellos que lieuan tan bien delos que façen derecho commo delos que façen tuerto. E aquelos tales son conpañeros del gato que comio el quesso.

8. E. c. q. se contiene p.—16. after señores is an erased d—18. ponerles.

Herlet, *op. cit.*, p. 36, considers this story original with Odo. It was also used by Odo's contemporary, Jacques de Vitry. Cf. Jacques de Vitry, *Exempla* (ed. Crane, London, 1890), Exemplum XI. Also a bibliographical note, p. 138.

6. *pornan.* Cf. Tobler, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 258. Cf. LI, l. 20.

8. Latin: *archidia[co]num qui deuorat parochiam et capellanum, hoc est caseum et ratum.*

16. What follows is not found in the Corpus Christi. The following was also taken from the *Espejo de los legos* MS, No. 117:

El arçobispo de Senona dio vn queso a vn loco el qual encerrolo enla su çesta e vinieron los mures e rroyeron el queso, e veyendolo el loco, conpro vn gato e pusolo enla çesta porque defendiesse el queso delos mures, el qual comio alos mures e al queso. Asi es delos bayles, los quales dados en guarda dela tierra para que corrijan alos malos onbres, mas rroban en vn dia sso cubierta del ssu offiçio que los ladrones en veynte.

XVII

ENXIENPLO DELOS CANES E LOS CUERUOS

Otrosi quando los canes fallan alguna bestia muerta, comen los canes dela. E mientra ellos la comen, los cueruos e las cornejas andanençima dela, bollando por el ayre atendiendo quando se yran los canes. E desque

2. e. las c.—3. y. l. cueruos.

2. *ençima dela bollando* should possibly be emended to read: *ençima del arbol;* Latin: *Cornices super arbores expectant.* As the Spanish makes good sense, I have not seen fit to change it.

los canes sson fartos e son ydos, vienen los cueruos e comen quanto falan enllos huessos.

Bien ansi acaesçe que los cardenales, los arçobispos, e los arçidianos gastan los capellanes e los clerigos pobres e despues uienen ssus onbres e sus escuderos e si falan alguna cosa enlos huesos, gastanlo e destruyenlo todo.

Otrosi aviene alos rreys e allos señores que destruyen asus vassallos e tomanles lo que han e non les abonda esto e consienten asus onbres que les tomen lo que han e los tales commo estos son conparados alos canes que comen las carnes delas bestias e uienen los cueruos e comen (*fol. 170r*) lo que finca. Ca los rreys e llos señores non façen cuenta desus labradores sinon commo bestias.

4. e non y.

10. What follows is not found in the Corpus Christi.

XVIII

Enxienplo del Mur e la Rrana conel Milano

Acaesçio vna vegada que el mur auia de pasar vna grand agua e rrogo alla rrana que lo passase alende. E dixo la rrana: Atate ami pierna e ansi te podre mejor pasar. El mur fiçolo ansi e uiolos el millano commo yuan atados e lleuolos amos y dos.

Bien ansi es de algunas dignidades, de algunas graçias [e de] algunos priorazgos que son dados [a] algunos clerigos e [a] algunos monjes que non saben nada de bien e que [non] lo meresçen e despues pierdenlo mala mente. Estonçe viene el diablo que se entiende por el millano e lieualos amos a dos. Ca lieua el capelan e lo suyo conel.

5. a. d. que son dados d. algunos g.

Herlet, *op. cit.*, pp. 16, 20.
Chauvin, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 123.
Juan Ruiz, *El libro de buen amor* (ed. Ducamin), coplas 407-14; *Libro de los enxemplos* (ed. Gayangos), CCCI.

4. It is a striking peculiarity that *amos y dos* and *amos a dos* should both occur in this short fable. Cf. Cuervo, *Dicc.*, under *ambos*, and Meyer-Lübke, *Gram.*, Vol. III, p. 258. *Amos y dos* occurs again, XXXV, l. 16.

XIX

Enxienplo del Lobo conlos Monjes

El lobo vna uegada quisso ser monje e rrogo a un conuento de monjes que lo quisiesen y rresçebir e los monjes fiçieronlo ansi e fiçieron al lobo la corona e dieronle cugula e todas las otras cosas que pertenesçen al

The vogue of this story during the Middle Ages was immense, as is shown by the many proverbs based on the tale. Wackernagel has a monograph entitled, "Der Wolf in der Schule," *Zschr. f. deut. Alt.*, Vol. VI, p. 285, in which he expresses the opinion that the story

monje e pusieronle a leer pater noster. El en lugar de deçir pater noster sienpre deçia cordero o carnero. E deçianle que parasse mientes al cruçifixo e al cuerpo de dios. El sienpre cataua el cordero o al carnero.

Bien ansi acaesçe a muchos monjes que en lugar de aprender la rregla dela orden, dela[s] cosas que pertenesçen a dios, sienpre rresponden e llaman: Carnero, que [se] entiende porlas buenas viandas e porel uino e por otros uiçios deste mundo. Esto mis[mo] se entiende eneste enxienplo (*fol. 170v*) por algunos viejos que son enuejeçidos en mal e en locura e en malas costunbres. Onde por mucho que otro los castigue, nunca quieren dexar sus viejas costunbres. Onde el onbre uiejo, antes lo podras quebrantar que non doblar. Faz all asno buena silla e buen freno quanto bien podieres e nunca podras del façer buen cauallo en quanto viuas.

8. casos q. — 14. F. allas non b.

was frequently acted out by the monks. Cf. also *Prov. Heinrici* (Müllenhoff u. Scherer, *Denkm.*), Vol. I, pp. 60, 62, in which the proverb is given in two different forms: *Cum lupus addiscit psalmas, desiderat agnos. In discendo lupus nimis affirmans ait agnus.* Cf. Vol. II, p. 139, note. I may add to the references quoted there, *Liber sententiolarum* (ed. Wackernagel, *Zschr. f. deut. Alt.*), Vol. VI, p. 305; also Rollard, *Faune Populaire*, Vol. V, p. 152. The proverb is omitted from the Spanish version probably because given in English form in most Latin MSS. The Corpus Christi has: *Thai thu W[o]lf hore hodi te preste tho thu hym sette Salmes to lere, evere beth his geres to the groue-ward.* It appears very differently in other MSS.

Herlet, *op. cit.*, pp. 25 f.

Chauvin, *op. cit.*, Vol. III, p. 41.

13. Latin: *Vetus retorta frangi potest, plicari non potest.*

14. Latin: *Pectina asinum, ablue asinum, rade asinum, nunquam perduces asinum ad bonum equum.* Gayangos' emendation at this point is a good example of the general inaccuracy of his text. The emendation is entirely arbitrary. In a footnote where he pretends to quote exactly the manuscript, he gives instead of *faz allas non buena silla, faz allar non buena silla.*

XX

ENXIENPLO DELAS OUEJAS CONEL LOBO

Las ouejas querelaronse vna vez del lobo al leon e deçian en plaça publica mente que el auia furtado muchas desus conpañeras e que las auia comidas. El leon desque uio esta querella ayunto su corte. Demando consejo alas mas cuerdas animalias que eran. E dixeron los puercos javalines: Señor, el lobo es mui messurado e de gran alfania e mui franco. Esto deçian ellos por quanto el lobo les auia conbidados muchas vezes a comer delas ouejas que furtara. Estonçe dixo el leon: Non diçen esso las ouejas. Respondio vna oueja e dixo: Señor leon, el

6. E. d. e. is repeated.

Herlet, *op. cit.*, p. 35.

5. *alfania* is equivalent to *ufania*. *Al-* occasionally replaces an initial vowel. Cf. Pidal, *Gram.*, §85, 3.

7. A slight omission. Latin: *Hoc non dicunt oues; audiamus illas.*

lobo comio ami padre e ami madre e comio ami fijo e yo mal a ves soy escapada desus manos. Esto mis[mo] dixeron todas las otras. E dixo el leon: Yo do por mi juyçio que enforquen al lobo e alos puercos que lo encubrieron e comieron del furto. Ansi que luego fue conplida la justiçia que mando façer el leon.

E llos lobos se entienden porlos rricos deste mundo que rroban lo ajeno e destruyen las ouejas de Ihesu Christo que se entienden porlos pobres. E dan dellas allos puercos que se entienden porlos rricos por vana gloria (*fol. 171r*) deste mundo porque cuidan que les ayudaran contralos señores e contralos merinos por cuidar porello veuir mas onrrados eneste mundo. E verna el nuestro señor el dia del juyçio e querelar se an las ouejas del lobo e por ventura los puercos porque ouieron parte del furto e comieron delo e querian tener vando dellos lobos, cuidando que stan ellos saluo[s] porque non fueron ellos en façer el furto, mas todo esto non les ualdra nada, ca nuestro señor fara enforcar los lobos e los puercos enel infierno. E diçe vn doctor que ansi dira nuestro señor el dia del juyçio: Visteme desnudo e non me uestiste nin me acorriste. Yd, malditos, al infierno para siempre jamas. Pues nuestro señor dixo esto alos onbres porque non façian bien delo suyo, quanto mas dira [a] aquellos que tomaron delo ajeno en testimonio?

14. lobos blotted but legible—15. oujejas—17. gloria repeated—20. p of por has cross dash—21. d. furta e cometieron delos.

24. Matt. 25:43. The quotation is not ascribed to a doctor in the Latin.

28. *testimonio*, a fine collected by a feudal lord by means of false evidence. Cf. Du Cange, *Gloss.*, *s. v.*

XXI

Enxienplo del Onbre Bueno conel Lobo

Acaesçio ansi que vn onbre bueno queria se yr en rromeria e auia doze ouejas e encomendolas assu conpadre el lobo que gelas guardase. El jurolo que gelas guardaria muy bien, ansi que el buen onbre fuese asu rromeria. El lobo guardo las ouejas en tal manera que el un dia comia la vna e el otro dia comia la otra. Quando el buen onbre vino, non fallo mas delas tres. El onbre bueno pregunto al lobo que que era delas otras ovejas. E dixole que eran muertas todas conel fuerte tienpo que fiziera. E dixo el onbre bueno: Pues las ouejas son muertas, dame las pellejas. Quando gelas dio, fallo señales delos dientes (*fol. 171v*) del lobo. El señor dela[s] ouejas dixo: Amigo, rrazon es que mueras por lo que feçiste. Cata aqui la señal delos tus dientes. En guisa que por la señal que fallo alli fizolo enforcar.

6. q. eran d.—9. f. dientes señallados d.

Herlet, *op. cit.*, p. 30.

9. Latin: *uestigia dencium.*

Bien ansi nuestro señor Ihesu Christo acomendo sus ouejas, que se entiende[n] porel su pueblo, alos obispos e alos curas. E muchos delos porsus malos enxienplos e porsu negligençia pierden las ouejas de Ihesu Christo. Onde el mal perlado es condenado a tantas muertes e a tantos tormentos quantos enxienplos malos da asus subjetos. Estonçe Ihesu Christo que es señor delas ouejas, para enforcar los lobos enla forca del infierno, demanda los pillejos que son los pecados porel cometidos.

16. es repeated.—dan.

XXII

What follows is the moral of the fable of the fox confessing to the cock (*De Volpe qui confitebatur peccata sua gallo, contra golosos*), the first part of which is lost owing to the disappearance of a folio in one of the parent manuscripts. The familiar fable of the wolf and the lamb (*De lupo et agno bibentibus*) may have come before this in the original Spanish version as it does in most Odo manuscripts.

Otrosi algunos onbres que andan en casa de algunos señores se façen amigos de todos e desque les pueden confonder, confondenlos muy buena mente quanto pueden. Otrosi es aun esto semejante [a] algunos onbres que vienen a casa delos señores a veuir e façense mui seruientes e estan penssando ensus coraçones commo los podran matar con yeruas o con otra manera. Estos tales son semejantes alla gulpeja e al gallo.

1. s. que f.—3. quando.

Herlet, *op. cit.*, p. 29.

5. *matar con yeruas=envenenar.* Cf. *Fuero juzgo* (ed. Real Acad. Esp., Madrid, 1815), *Glossary*, *s. v.*

XXIII

ENXIENPLO DELO QUE ACAESÇIO ALLOS ONBRES CONLLOS ASNOS

Acaesçio ansi que vna vez vnos onbres que trayan vnos asnos en rromeria cargaronlos mucho e fazianlos andar todo el dia e quando non querian andar, dauanles muchos pallos. E vn dia pasauan por vn camino e fallaron un leon e llos onbres començaron a foyr del e los (*fol. 172r*) asnos penssaron entresi mesmos que, pues los onbres auian miedo delos leones, que tomasen ellos pieles de leones que las vistiesen e luego aurian miedo los onbres delos e fiçieronlo ansi. Despues que los asnos se ouieron vestidas las pieles delos leones, [saltauan] dela vna parte e dela otra e los onbres fuyan delos cuydando que eran leones. Ellos estando en esto, los asnos començaron a bramar e los onbres escucharon e dixeron: Estas

1. e. rrogria c.—4. e l. e los onbres començaron a foyr e los a.—7. ouieeron—10. e of escucharon written by a later hand

Herlet, *op. cit.*, pp. 30-33.

8. Latin: *saltabant.*

bozes de asno[s] son mas que de leones e lleguemosnos aellos e veremos que son. E llegaron tanto fasta que los vieron las colas e los pies. E dixeron: Çierta mente estos son asnos, que non leones. E llegaron aellos en manera que los tomaron e dieronles muchos pallos.

Estos asnos son los onbres falsos e perezosos de seruir a dios e toman la orden de San Benito mas por estar viçiosos e porque les onrren los onbres, que non por seruir a dios. E estos tales a vezes echan bramidos de asnos que [se] entienden quando fablan de luxuria e de otros viçios. Estonçe podemos deçir: La tu palabra te faz manifiesto. E bien podemos entender que tales commo estos son asnos del diablo mas non monjes.

15. E. ombres s.—19. L. su p.

13. For *que non* as equivalent to *et non*, cf. Diez, *Gram.*, Vol. III, pp. 1061 f.

19. Matt. 26:73: *loquela tua manifestum te facit.* For *loquela*, Odo has written *lingua* in the Corpus Christi.

XXIV

Enxienplo delo que acaesçio a Galter con vna Muger

Vn onbre que auia nonbre Galter pusso de yr buscar vn logar do sienpre ouiesse gozo e nunca pudiese su coraçon entresteçer. E tanto andido fasta que fallo en vna tierra vna muger muy fermosa e era linda e auia poco que muriera (*fol. 172v*) su marido. E desque la uio Galter, fuese para ella. E ella preguntole que que queria. El dixola: Yo ando buscando dos cosas, la vna que falle vn logar do sienpre goze, [la otra] que nunca mi coraçon pueda ser triste. E dixo la muger estonçe: Si tu quisieras ser mi marido, e folgaras aqui e avras todo quanto ouieres menester. Ca darte[e] yo casas, tierras, viñas e otros muchos bienes. E fuele mostrar su posada e mostrole primera mente el palaçio. E desque vio el palaçio, plugule mucho. E preguntole aella: Deçit, señora: A do esta la cama enque auemos de dormir de noche? Ella fue [e] mostrole vna cama e en ella un leon. E en [derredor de] aquel lecho staua dela [vna] parte vn oso e dela otra vn lobo e dela otra muchos gujanos e dela

7. ser is the correction of another hand—9. cosas.

Herlet, *op. cit.*, p. 36.
Chauvin, *op. cit.*, Vol. III, p. 10.

---

6. Latin: *Duo quero, scilicet locum ubi semper gaudeam, nec in carne, nec in corde doleam.* Three things are desired in the *Gesta Romanorum* version (ed. Oesterley, Berlin, 1872), Vol. II, pp. 426 ff. They are: *habundancia sine defectu, gaudium sine tristicia*, and *lumen sine tenebris.*

9. The emendation *casas* is justified by *domos* in the Latin.

13. The Corpus Christi MS affords no basis for the word *leon.* Notice that there is no further mention of a lion in the moral. It is interesting to note, however, in the *Gesta Romanorum* version that the animals who stand around the bed are: the lion, i. e., the devil; a dragon, i. e., death; a bear, i. e., one's conscience; worms, i. e., one's accusing sins.

Latin: *circa lectum.*

14. *gujanos.* A frequent orthography in this text and the *Enxenplos* MS. The *Enxenplos* also has *figico* for *fisico* (IV); *vigitar* for *visitar* (XI); *iglegia* for *iglesia* (XIX, LVII). Cf. *tijeras*, Old Spanish *tiseras.*

otra muchas serpientes. E estonçe dixo [Galter:] E las tus rriquezas e los tus bienes anme de durar para siempre? Estonçe rrespondio ella e dixo: Digote que non, ca mi marido que las avia muerto es. Eso mismo te conuiene ati morir. E uees este lecho? Dixo el: Si. Dixo ella: Aqueste oso te ha de matar. Non se si sera la primera noche o a cabo de vn año o a cabo de diez o por ventura viuiras mas. El lobo e los gujanos e llas serpientes te han de tragar ati e a todas tus cosas. E rrespondio: Todas estas cosas son buenas mas este lecho me espanta que [nin] porti nin por todo el mundo non estaria enel. E despidiosse dela e fuese su camino. E fuese a un rreyno que auia poco que era muerto el rrey. E dixeronle los onbres del rreyno: Galtar, seades bien venido (*fol. 173r*). Rrogamoste que nos digas que es lo que buscas. El dixo: Busco lugar do sienpre goze [e que] nunca aya pessar. E dixeronle los onbres: Sey nuestro rrey e avras todo lo que ovieres menester. Cata aqui que palaçio e que camaras [e] que rriquezas. Entre todas las cosas que le mostraron, mostraronle vn lecho que staua guissado de otras tales bestias commo le mostrara la muger. E dixo Galter: Sy yo fuere rrey en esta tierra avre de yazer eneste lecho? Dixeronle los otros: Sy. Estonçe dixo Galter: Estas bestias que aqui stan, façer me an mal? [Rrespondieron los onbres:] El oso te matara. Las otras gastaran todo lo tuyo ansi commo fiçieron alos otros rreys. Mas non sabemos quando nin quando non. Rrespondio Galter: Peligrosso es este lecho e el rreyno non lo tomaria por cosa del mundo pues he de yazer eneste lecho e poresto me quiero yr. E fuese e andido tanto fasta que lego a un palaçio muy fermoso. Todas las paredes e la madera eran de oro e de piedras preçiosas. E los onbres que enel morauan, fiçieronlo señor del palaçio e de todas las otras rriquezas. Desi apostremas mostraronle otro tal lecho commo los otros. El espantose mucho del ansi commo las otras vezes. E fuese su camino e acaesçio que falo vn viejo asentado al pie de vn escallera. E lla escallera estaua llegada a un muro e enella auia tres escalones. El uiejo que estaua enla escallera pregunto a Galter que que queria. E el dixo: Querria lugar enque siempre goze e que nunca aya tristeza. E dixole el uiejo: Galter, sube por esta [escalera] de tres escalones e falaras lo que cobdiçias. E Galter subio porla (*fol. 173v*) escalera e falo lo que cobdiçiaua.

18. esto lechos with s crossed out—25. l of del written by a different hand—venido repeated—27. g. a n. a. pessaz—45. estalones

24. The double repetition of what is practically the same adventure does not occur in the *Gesta Romanorum* version which doubtless stands nearer the original source than does Odo's. I do not agree with Herlet that the author of the *Gesta* took this fable from Odo.

33. Latin: *Responderunt: Vrsa te*, etc.

44. There are seven steps in the *Gesta Romanorum* version representing the seven *opera misericordiae*. However, in ascending, three blows are struck with a staff and the allegorical significance of these is the same as that of three steps in Odo's version.

47. Latin: *istam scalam*.

Esto se entiende por muchos onbres que cobdiçian estas tres cosas o algunas destas tres cosas, que buscan fermossas mugeres por pecado o rreynos o señorios o dignidades por onrra o por oro o por plata o por vanagloria o por cobdiçia. Mas si bien parasen mientes enque lecho an de dormir, non aurian cuydado de tales cosas. Que qualquier onbre o muger que viua eneste pecado yaze en mal lecho commo aquel. [El] osso que staua a la cabeçera del lecho sse entiende porla muerte que non perdona a ninguno eneste mundo, alto nin baxo nin pequeno nin grand. E de aquel osso cuenta enel libro de Ose: Commo la osa [que] ha perdidos sus fijos, [si] alguno toma, destorpalo todo, bien asi destorpare yo las entrañas desus coraçones. Que ansi commo la osa que ha perdidos sus fijos non perdona a ninguno, bien ansi la muerte nunca perdona a ninguno, nin rrico nin pobre. Los lobos se entienden porlos servidores dellos [rreys] o delos señores que [non] han cuidado desus almas que se saluen, antes les consejan façer cosas que sean a onrra del mundo e a pro desus cuerpos. E alas vezes les consejan mas asu pro dellos que non desus señores, por cobdiçia de lleuar algo dellos. E tanto que façen ellos pro conlos señores, e tanto les da[n] consejo que se dañen commo que se saluen. Los gusanos rroeran el cuerpo e lo tragaran. Las serpientes son los diablos que lleuaran las animas dellos dapnados allas penas del infierno. Sobre todas las otras cosas nos guarde delas serpientes, nuestro señor dios. Onde diçese [destas tres] enel libro Eclegiastico: Quando muera el onbre, heredarlo an serpientes e bestias e gusanos. El dapnado se parte en tres partes; las serpientes que se entienden porlos diablos que lieuan el alma e las bestias que se entienden porllos onbres que biuen eneste mundo ansi commo bestias e ansi commo lobos cobdiçiosos que lleuaran los bienes delos muertos e los gujanos comeran el cuerpo.

Onde vn grand señor encontro vnos monjes que lleuauan a enterrar vn grand logrero e pre- (*fol. 176r*) gunto el señor allos monjes que que trayan. Ellos respondieronle que trayan el cuerpo de [a]quel onbre e los dineros que los avia mandados. E dixo el señor: Non sera ansi, ca

51. after cosas is repeated s. e. p. m. o.—56. e. dela mugerte q.—58. o. perdiera s.—59. t. destero palo t.—62. p. señores. d.—64. las—68. reeran—70. n. guarda destas tres n.—73. e. llos onbres q. s. e. p. las bestias q.—74. q. lieuen e.—78. e. pre- repeated

58. Cf. my article, *Mod. Lang. Notes*, January, 1905, for a discussion of "El Libro del Oso," a myth originating in Gayangos' faulty reading of this passage. Cf. Osee, 13:8: *Occurram eis quasi ursa, raptis catulis; et dirumpam interiora jecoris eorum*, etc. The change of *perdiera* to *ha perdidos* is, I think, justified not only by the Latin but by the reading in line below. After the word *fijos* begins the false insertion alluded to in the introduction, p. 3.

62. Latin: *lupi sunt consanguinei et ministri regum*, etc.

70. Latin: *Quicquid sit de aliis, a serpentibus defendat nos Deus! De hiis tribus*, etc.

71. Ecc. 10:13. *Cum enim morietur homo, hereditabit serpentes et bestias, et vermes.*

80. Cf. the following passage from the Arçipreste de Talavera, *Corvacho* (Madrid, 1901), p. 290: *Asy lo traen engañado el mundo e el diablo, por donde muere mala muerte e lieua el*

este onbre mio fue, e vos e los gujanos [avran] el cuerpo mas yo avre los dineros. El diablo lleuara el anima.

Sy vos todos aquellos queredes saluar, façet ansi commo Galter que subio enla escallera dorada de Jacob delos tres escalones. El primero escalon se entiende auer el onbre contriçion desus pecados e pessarlle mucho porque los ha fechos e poner ensu coraçon de nunca mas tornar enellos. El segundo escalon es confessarse el onbre verdadera mente, ca si el onbre va a confession e confiessa veynte pecados e dexa vno, membrandosele, quando partiere dela confesion tiene todos los otros e vno demas porque non confiessa verdadera mente. El tercero escalon es enmendar a dios por penitençia desus pecados segun que gela diere su confesor, otrosi enmendar [a] su proximo todos los tuertos que le tiene en qualquier manera que gelos oviere fechos, o por tomar algo delo suyo e por leuantarle falsso testimonio o por auerle buscado mal conlos señores o por otros tuertos muchos que se pueden acussar o acaesçer entrelos onbres e entrelas mujeres, o por peleas o por otros males. Ca diçe Ihesu Christo enel euuangelio: Si fueres ofreçer al altar e se te menbrare enel camino que tienes tuerto atu vezino o atu proximo, dexa la ofrenda e ve e fazle [e]mienda. E desque le ouieres (*fol. 176v*) fecho emienda, tornate a ofreçer. E todo onbre que fiçiere estas tres cosas que se entiende[n] por [los] tres scalones, e si subiere porellos, sepa que subira alla gloria perdurable do non aura tristeza ninguna. Alla qual gloria nos traya dios. Amen.

81. g. al c.—91. e. mansar a

cuerpo la tierra e los gusanos, e la anima los diablos, e las riquezas los parientes o quiça quien non los pensara heredar nin gozar dellos. It would appear that the arch-priest, who was well read in the literature of his day must have been acquainted with Odo either in the Latin or the Spanish, unless he obtained it from Juan Ruiz, *El libro de buen amor* (ed. Ducamin), coplas 1534–43, who also may have had Odo as a source.

97. Matt. 5:23, 24.

XXV

ENXIENPLO DELOS DOS CONPAÑEROS

Vna vegada acaesçio que dos conpañeros que fallaron vna grand conpaña de ximios. Dixo el vno al otro: Yo apostare que gane yo agora mas por deçir mentira que tu por deçir verdad. E dixo el otro: Digote que non faras, ca mas ganare yo por deçir verdad que tu por deçir mentira. E si esto non crees, apostemos. Dixo el otro: Plaçeme. E desque ouieron fecho su apuesta, fue el mentiroso e llegose alos ximios e dixole un ximio

Herlet, *op. cit.*, 16.
Chauvin, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, pp. 154, 159; Vol. V, pp. 13–15.
Köhler, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, pp. 281 ff.; Vol. II, pp. 369 f.
Juan Manuel, *El Conde Lucanor* (ed. Knust), pp. 110–15, 187–93.

4. Notice the omission of the object in l. 94.

que estaua y por mayoral delos otros: Di, amigo. Que te paresçe denos otros? E respondio el mentiroso: Señor, paresçeme que soys vn rrey muy poderoso e estos otros ximios que son las mas fermosas cosas del mundo e los onbres vos preçian mucho. En manera que los linsongeo tanto quanto pudo en guisa que por las lisonjas que les dixo dieronle muy bien a comer e onrraronle mucho e dieronle mucha plata e mucho oro e muchas otras rriquezas. E despues llego el verdadero e preguntaronle los ximios que que le paresçia de aquella conpaña. E rrespondio el verdadero e dixo que nunca viera tan suçia conpaña nin tan (*fol. 177r*) feos e que: Atalles commo vos preçian son locos. Estonçe fueronse para el e sacaronle los ojos. E desque le ouieron sacados los ojos, fueronse e dexaronlo desanparado. E estonçe Buena Verdad oyo bozes de osos e de lobos e de otras bestias que andauan porel monte. Atento lo mejor que pudo e subiose en un arbol por miedo que le comerian las bestias. E el que estaua ençima de aquel arbol, haevos las bestias que se ayuntaron todas a cabildo so el arbol. E preguntauanse las vnas allas otras deque tierra eran o que condiçiones auian cada vna delas bestias o conque arte sabian cada vna escapar de mano dellos onbres. E dixo la rrapossa: Yo se çerca de aqui do ay un rrey que aquel rrey es el mas nesçio onbre que yo nunca vy e tiene vna fija muda en casa. Poderla ya lijera mente sanar si quisiese sinon que non sabe. E dixeron los otros: Commo seria esso? E dixo ella: Yo vos lo dire. El domingo quando van ofreçer las buenas mugeres e dexan el pan sobre las fuesas, e vo yo e rrebato vna torta. Si el primero bocado que yo tomo, melo sacasen dela boca antes que yo lo tragase e gelo diesen a comer, luego fablaria. E otra nesçedad mayor vos dire que aquel rrey que esta çiego e tiene vna lancha de piedra encabo desu casa. Si aquella fuese alçada, saldria vna fuente de alli e quantos çiegos se vntasen los ojos con aquel agua luego guaresçerian. E des[que] fue amanesçido (*fol. 177v*), fueronse las bestias de alli. E ellas que sse yuan, pasauan vnos harruqueros por alli. E Buena Verdad, que estaua ençima de aquel arbol, que avia miedo delo que las bestias dixeron, dio bozes alos harruqueros que yuan. E dixeron los harruqueros: Santa Maria! vozes de onbres son aquellas que oymos. Vamos alla. E desque llegaron, fallaron a Buena Verdad do staua ençima del arbol. E preguntaronle quien era. Dixo: Buena Verdad. Ellos dixeronle: Amigo, qui te paro

14. les — 15. nin tan repeated — 17. ouioren — 24. Y. so c. — 25. q. oy n. — 26. fijo — 38. harrugueros — harrugueros

7. *nos otros* is only used in this text to bring out a contrast. Cf. Cuervo, *Notas*, p. 42.

10. *linsongeo*. An error or an example of epenthesis?

18. It is at this point that the second story is added to the fable we find in Odo. Cf. Introduction, p. 17.

19. *Atento*, modern *tentó*. Cf. Cuervo, *Dicc.*, *s. v.*

38. *harruqueros*, modern *arrieros*. For another example of the word, cf. Juan Ruiz, *El Libro de Buen Amor* (ed. Ducamin), p. 168, variant. Cf. Rinconete y Cortadillo (ed. Marín, Sevilla, 1905), pp. 361 f.

tal? E el dixoles: Vn mio conpañero. Mas pidovos de merçet que digades do ydes. Ellos dixeron: Ymos atal rreyno conestas mercadurias. E dixoles: Rruegovos que me querays lleuar alla por amor de dios e que me pongades alla puerta del rrey. E llos harruqueros dixeron que les plaçia e fiçieronlo ansi. E desque se vio y, dixo al portero: Amigo, rruegote que digas al rrey que esta aqui vn onbre que lo guaresçera della çeguedad que el ha e aun que le mostrara conque su fija fable. E el portero entro e dixolo al rrey: Señor, alli esta vn onbre que dize que uos sanara delos ojos sy vos quisieredes que entre delante vos. E dixo estonçe el rrey: Amigo, dille que entre e veremos lo que diçe. El portero fue e traxolo ante el rrey. Desque fue ante el rrey, dixo: Señor, [sea] la vuestra merçet que mandeys alçar vna lancha que esta encabo de vuestro palaçio e saldra (*fol. 178r*) vna fuente, que qualquier çiego que se llauare los ojos en aquella agua luego sera guarido. E señor, porque lo creades, lauarme [e] yo primero que non vos. El rrey desque oyo aquello, mando luego asus onbres que alçasen la lancha e ansi commo fue alçada, salio luego la fuente e vino la Verdad e lauo luego sus ojos e nasçieronle luego los ojos ansi commo de antes los solia auer. El rrey lauo luego sus ojos e cobro su uista. E despues todos los onbres della tierra, que qualquier çiego que venia a se llauar los ojos conella, luego eran guaridos. Estonçe dixo Buena Verdad al rrey: Señor, sea la vuestra merçet, que aun otra cosa te quiero mostrar, que quieras el domingo parar tus onbres arrededor delas fuesas e paren mientes quando veniere la rraposa a tomar del pan que lieuan las buenas mugeres a ofreçer, el primer bocado que mitiere enla boca, echenle mano tus onbres ala rrapossa ala garganta e saquengelo e non gelo dexen comer e denlo a comer atu fija e luego fablara. El rrey mandolo façer ansi commo el mandara e los onbres desque ouieron tomado el bocado alla rraposa dela garganta tanto ouieron priesa de lleuar el pan ala infanta conque fablase que non touieron alla rraposa e dexaronla yr. E la ora que la infanta comio el pan luego fablo. El rrey desque uio esto, mando façer mucha merçet a Buena (*fol. 178v*) Verdad, lo vno por[que] auia guarido ael delos ojos e lo otro porque auia guaresçido asu fija. E los dela corte le façian mucha onrra e yuan conel fasta la posada e le dauan muchos dones por aquel bien que les auia fecho. E yendo vn dia porla calle mui bien uestido e en buen cauallo e muchas conpañas conel encontro a Malla Verdad e conosçiolo luego e marauillose mucho [que] le veya sano delos ojos e tan bien andante. E fue asu posada e dixole: Dios te salue, amigo. E dixole Buena Verdad: Amigo, bien seas venido. [E rrespondio Mala Verdad:] Amigo, quererte ya rrogar que me dixeses conque guaresçiste del mal delos ojos. Ca tengo vn fijo çiego e querialo sanar si podiese. Rruegote que me muestres commo

46. After dixo there is a small cross which may be the abbreviation of the first syllable of verdad — 53. mandays — 54. e s. repeated — 74. E delos d.

deprendiese. E todo esto deçia Mala Verdad por cuita de saber commo llegara [a] aquella onrra e [a] aquel estado. Estonçe Buena Verdad que non sabe de al sinon de verdad dixole: Viste, amigo, quando tu me sacaste los ojos enel monte, e uiste ese arbol grande que y staua. Con cuyta suby enel e juntaronse y todas las animalias del mundo a façer cabildo. E contole todo el fecho commo le acaesçiera. E Mala Verdad desque supo aquello, plogole mucho e fuese quanto pudo para alla. E subiose ençima de aquel arbol e el estando y, heuos las bestias do se juntaron a cabildo so aquel arbol. E dixo [la rraposa:] Estamos aqui todos? E dixeron todos (*fol. 179r*): Comadre, si. E dixo: Conpadres, quanto aqui dixe en otra noche ansi fue dicho al rrey. E echaronme sus onbres mano ala garganta que a pocas non me afogaron. E dixo el vno: Pues yo non dixe. E dixo el otro: Yo non lo dixe. E juraron todos que lo non dixeran. E dixo la rrapossa: Pues non lo dixistes, quiera dios que non nos aseche aqui alguno. Alço los ojos arriba e vio a Mala Verdad e dixo: Alla estays vos. Yo uos fare que malla pro uos faga el bocado que me sacasstes dela boca. E dixo al oso: Conpadre, vos que soys mas lijero, sobid alla. El oso sobio e derribolo a tierra. Estonçe despedaçaronle las bestias e comieron[lo] todo.

Enxienplo. Deuen parar mentes aquellos que quieren façer o deçir traeçiones o falsedades que [si] non se fallen mal vn año, falarse an a dos, e si non, fallarse an allos diez. E si por ventura lo fazen por consejo o por mandado de alguno, aquellos que[ge]lo consejan o gelo mandan, aquellos los tiene[n] despues por partes. E aunque ensu vida non se fallen mal, fallarse an despues enla muerte do les da dios tan mal galardon porello commo dieron las animalias a Mala Verdad.

89. an erased se stands after aquello — 92. todos repeated — 93. an f standing before the s of ansi has been erased — 98. delat, the t has been crossed out — 104. v. non l.

83. *deprendiese*, modern *aprendiese*. Cf. Cuervo, *Dicc.*, *s. v.*
99. Possibly *soys* should be changed to *sobys*.
103. Cf. XXVI, l. 16.
105. *consejan*, modern *aconsejan*.

XXVI

Enxienplo del Abispa conla [A]rraña

Dixo el abispa al arraña: Tu nunca buelas mas sienpre stas enlos forados. Mas bolaria yo en un dia que non farias tu en diez. Dixo la [a]rraña: Yo te aposstare un quartal de vino (*fol. 179v*) que non diçes verdad. La abispa dixo: Bebamos primero el uino sso este arbol. E dixo

1. *nunca buelas;* possibly it should read *nada uales*. The Latin has: *nichil uales*.
3. *quartal* translates *galonem*.
4. An omission. *Bibamos primo, et qui defecerit uinum persoluet. Dixit Vespa: Bibamos in hac arbore*, etc. In the Latin the words *Bibamos primo* are uttered by the spider.

el araña: Non quiero, que tengo aguissada vna cortina mui blanca e muy fermosa e ay nos sentaremos muy bien. E el abispa se fue conel araña, cuydando que deçia verdad. E el araña metiola ensu tella. E luego que el abispa sse assento enla tella rreboluiose la tella alos pies e alla cabeça e començose a sacudir mas non pudo salir dende. Estonçe dixo la abispa: Maldicha sea tal cortina onde el onbre non puede salir. Çierta mente, dixo el araña, nunca de aqui saldras viua. E allegose aella e afogola.

El araña se entiende porel diablo que pone este coraçon alos onbres, de tomar barraganas e tomar rriquezas e algo ajeno que es malganado. E despues que enello estan non se pueden partir dello. Aquestas cosas son dichas cortinas del diablo. E afogalos mas non saben quando nin quando non, ssy un dia, sinon a dos, sinon a diez, commo dize la fablilla de Galtar. Si alguna cosa començares, para mientes que salgas conella ansi commo el fizo que puso de ir catar a do sienpre ouiese gozo e sin tristeza.

5. q. non t.—18. p. deçir c.

5. The *non* after *que* is not justified by the Latin.
18. For the emendation, cf. XXIV, l. 1.

XXVII

ENXIENPLO DELA MARIPOSA

Acaesçio vna vegada que la mariposa bolaua porlos almendrales e porlos otro[s] arboles floridos e porlos mançanos [e porlas rrosas e porlos lilios e porlas otras flores] e desque ouo bien bolado vinose a sentar a un moradral do estaua estiercol de bestias e de bues e fallo aly asu muger. E ella preguntole que de donde venia (*fol. 180r*). E el rrespondiole: Çerque la tierra e he bolado porlas flores delos almendros e delos lilios mas nunca fale tan plaçentero lugar commo este.

Ansi es de muchos clerigos e monjes e legos que aun[que] las vidas delos santos oyen e passan porel valle delos lilios e porlas rrosas que se entienden porlos martires e porlas uioletas que se entienden [porlos] confessores, mas ninguna vida destas non les paresçe tan plaçentera commo llas malas mujeres o su conpania que non son al sy non estiercol e allegamiento de pecados. E poresto diçe la santa scriptura Eclegiastica: Toda mala muger ansi commo estiercol ssera follada enel camino. Pues mal-

5. Venia repeated—10. p. l. confessores e porlos m.—12. s. ansy n. e.—14. s. fallada enel infierno

Herlet, *op. cit.*, p. 36.

1. Latin: *Scrabo semel uolauit per amigdalinas arbores florentes, per pomaria, per rosas, per lilia et alios flores.*
3. *moradral*, modern *muladar*; Portuguese, *muradal.*
4. *Equus* is generally translated *bestia.* For examples of *bue*, *bues*, cf. *Fuero de Salamanca* (ed. Ruano), pp. 24, 26, 76, 84, 91. Also *Libro de los enxenplos* (Madrid MS), CCCLXXV.
14. Ecc. 9:10: *Omnis mulier quae est fornicaria quasi stercus in via conculcabitur.*

dicha es tal mariposa e aquien mejor paresçe el estiercol de pecado e los diablos que non Ihesu Christo o [el estiercol] delas golondrinas que çiega los ojos, que non faze la vida delos [santos]. E poresto diçe Sant Augustin: Ental manera ha[n] rronpido el palaçio del coraçon e porla fiebre de maldades.

18. an erased r above and after manera.

16. The common superstition that swallows' dung causes blindness may go back to the story of Tobias (*Tob.* 2:10, 11).

XXVIII

Enxienplo del Aguilla conel Cueruo

Ell aguila vna vegada auia mal delos ojos. El cueruo que es fisico delas aues demandole consejo que que podria façer para el mal delos ojos. Dixo el cueruo: Yo traere vna buena yerua que uos sanara luego. E dixo el aguila: Si tu esso façes, yo te dare buen galardon. Estonçe el cueruo tomo el çumo dellas çebolas e fizo enplasto e pusogelo enlos ojos e ansi commo gelo ouo puesto çego luego el (*fol. 180v*) aguilla. E despues que el cueruo lo uio ciego comio asus fijos [e firio el aguila mesmo con muchos golpes.] E dixo el aguilla: Maldicha sea tu meleçina que non veo nin punto. Ençima desto me as comido mis fijos. El cueruo rre[s]pondio: Mientra que tu veyas, nunca podia comer detus fijos, maguer que mucho los deseaua comer, e hago[ra] despues que tu fueste çiego es el mio deseo conplido.

Porel aguila se entiende el perllado. Ca el perlado ha los ojos abiertos que esta en buen stado e guardando [su pueblo] de pecado, que non ha cuydado de otra cosa saluo de seruir a dios e de guardar su pueblo, los fijos del aguila. E el cueruo se entiende porel diablo que esta deseando aqueste pueblo para lo matar e comer. Mientra aquel perlado ha los ojos abiertos todo su deseo es nada. Mas que façe el diablo? Faze un [en]plasto de ligamiento delas cosas tenporales e echalo enel coraçon del perlado, por tal que ponga enellas todo su cuydado, que non pueda enal pensar nin entender enlas cosas çelestiales. E ansi lo façe el perlado, ca pone todo su cuydado ensus rrentas e enlas otras cosas temporales ansi que los ojos çelestiales son çiegos. E despues el diablo come los fijos, feriendo el aguila dela vna parte e dela otra. Esta postura fiço

6. el repeated—11. çiega—e. miedo c.—13. e. pecado h.—20. enellos—puedan—24. f. mis c. G. e G.

Herlet, *op. cit.*, p. 34.
Libro de los enxemplos (ed. Gayangos), CCXIV.

1. Crows are popularly supposed to put out the eyes of their enemies. Cf. Rolland, *Faune populaire*, Vol. II, p. 106.
7. Latin: *ipsam Aquilam multis percussionibus infestauit.* Cf. l. 24.
11. Latin: *desiderium meum est completum.*
19. Latin: *et proicit in oculos prelatorum.*

Naas Ammonites con Gabet Galeat, que el con todos los suyos que se saqu[as]en los ojos (*fol. 181r*) derechos e que los dexaria en paz, ansi commo se cuenta enel primer libro delos rreys. Aquel paresçe alla serpiente antigua que façe tanto quanto puede [alos perlados e alos clerigos] por los toler los ojos sprituales, porque non puedan conosçer las [cosas] çelestiales eneste [mundo si non las cosas tenporales] que son a siniestro. Ansi, muchos otorgan enesto [e muchos] a[n]menos el vn ojo.

26. ojos repeated—27. paresçen—30, 31. c. enesto ansi q. s. a s. A. commo m. o. e. amenos e. v. o.

25. *Primus regum*, 11:1, 2. From this point on we have to do with the most corrupt passage in the *Gatos*. The following is my basis for emendation: *Naas dicitur serpens; ad hoc nititur serpens antiqu[u]s, ut oculos spirituales a prelatis et clericis eruat, ne celestia, sed terrena que a sinistris sunt ualeant contemplari; et multi adquiescunt, multi sunt monachi* (variant *monoculi*).

31. In the MS we have *amenos* = *an menos*. Cf. *amenester* = *an menester*, XLI, l. 30, and *amiedo* = *an miedo*, XLIII, l. 20. Are these instances to be explained by a dropping of the tilde or are they examples of the assimilation of *nm* to *m*, such as we observe in *comigo* and *emendar*? Cf. Cuervo, *Rev. Hisp.*, Vol. V, p. 305; Munthe, *op. cit.*, p. 39.

XXIX

ENXIENPLO DEL CAUALLERO CONEL ONBRE BUENO

Vn cauallero pregunto a un onbre bueno que era letrado, qual seria el gozo que los onbres en parayso au[r]ian. Rrespondio el letrado e dixo: Tal sera el gozo que nin los ojos lo uieron nin orejas lo oyeron nin coraçon de onbre lo podria penssar aquelo que dios tiene aparejado [a] aquellos que le aman. E dixo el cauallero: Aquellos que desean caçar con aues e con canes, quando fueren en parayso, fallaran canes o aues? E rrespondio el letrado: Non lo mande dios que los canes entran en tan fermoso lugar e tan plaçentero commo el parayso. E dixo el cauallero: Çierta mente se ouiese en parayso canes o aues, mucho mas desearia yr alla. E rrespondio el lletrado: Amigo, vna vegada el leon conbido a todas las otras bestias e fizo muy grand ayantar e dioles muchos manjares e muy saboros[os.] E despues que ouieron comido, todas se tornaron cada vna asu logar. El lobo encontro ala puerca enel camino que staua comiendo somas. (*fol. 181v*) E dixo la puerca: Donde uienes, lobo? Rrespondio el lobo e dixo: Vengo del muy buen ayantar que nos dio el leon. E tu, por que [non] fuiste y? E dixo la puerca: Ouistes buenos comeres e bien adobados? E rrespondio el lobo: Digote que si, que ouimos capones e perdiçes e pauones e otros muchos manjares bien adobados. Estonçe

5. q. be, erased d.—13. a. puerta e.

3. Epis. Pauli ad Cor. prima, 2:9.

9. *se* for modern *si*. Cf. *El libro de Alexandre* (ed. Janer), coplas 1, 73; Berceo, *Del Sacrificio de la Missa* (ed. Janer), copla 118.

11. *ayantar*=*yantar*.

16. The lack of *non* probably goes back to the Latin: *Et tu, ut (sic) fuisti ibi?*

dixo la puerca: Ouo y bellotas o ssomas? Dixo el lobo: Maldicha seas que preguntas! Nunca lo mande dios que en tal ayantar adobasen tan villes uiandas!

Esto se entiende que muchos que todas las cosas an eneste mundo que podrian auer para yr a parayso non les paresçen bien nin cobdiçian nada nin se pagan de al sinon de somas que se entiende por pecado commo luxuria o conplazenterias deste mundo. E desto se cuenta enla santa scriptura: Dios amaua los fijos de Ysrael e ellos aman a dioses ajenos, aman vinos de muchas maneras, que se entiende por pecados.

20. d. quien t.—22. entienden—23. p. façer p.

21. Osee 3:1: *diligit Dominus filios Israel, et ipsi respiciunt ad deos alienos et diligunt vinacia uvarum.* A faulty rendering. *Uvarum* has probably been mistaken for some form of *varius*. Hence, *de muchas maneras.*

XXX

Enxienplo del Onbre que araua conlos Escarauacos

Vn onbre araua vna vegada e ato dos escarauacos al arado e uino otro onbre e dixole: Por que atas atales bestias commo son aquestas atu arado? Rrespondio el yuguero: Porque todas las cosas ayudan al arado quantas le pueden tirar. Ansi que muchas vegadas menazaua el alos escarauacos (*fol. 182r*) tan bien commo alos bueys que andoviesen. E quando fue ora de uiesperas que tanieron las canpanas, fuese el onbre consus bueys para su casa e los escarauacos fincaron alli que non quissieron obedesçer al yuguero.

Tales son muchos onbres eneste mundo aquien dios amenaza e castiga mas por todo esto nunca se quieren partir dela suçidad del pecado. Delos quales cuenta enla santa scriptura que dize dios: Enbieuos la muerte enel camino de Egipto. [Feri] conmi cuchilo vuestros fijos e fize sobir el olor de vuestros castillos envuestras narizes e non vos tornastes

4. tiras.—5. q. quando a.—8. yueguero—12. e fizo sentir

Herlet, *op. cit.*, p. 34.

Title. *escarauacos* = *escarabajos.*

3. Latin: *Quoniam totum iuuat quicquid non retro trahit.* The form *tiras* in the manuscript reading may be a fusion of *tira atras.*

4. *menazaua* = *amenazaba.*

5. At this point the text departs from the original and makes but slight sense. *Stimulauit Scrabones frequenter; sed quando uenerunt ad busacias uaccarum, semper ibi moram fecerunt, nec Rustico aliquo modo obedierunt.* The translator probably did not understand *busacias*, which is a French, rather than a Latin word.

10. *suçidat.* Cf. Fuero Juzgo (ed. Real Acad. Esp.), *Glossary; El libro de los exenplos* (Madrid MS), CXVII, CXIX.

11. Amos 4:10. *Misi in vos mortem in via Aegypti; percussi in gladio juvenes vestros (usque ad captivitatem equorum vestrorum); et ascendere feci putredinem castrorum in nares vestras; et non redistis ad me, dicit Dominus.* The translator evidently did not regard the last two words as part of the quotation. The part in parentheses is not quoted in the Corpus Christi.

ami. Esto se entiende por que dios a muchos onbres eneste mundo dales primero mucho bien. Ellos non llo quieren cognosçer conello. E desque dios vee esto, tirales los algos. E [si] poresto non se emiendan tirales los parientes e los amigos. E si poresto non se emiendan, tirales los fijos. E si non lo quieren cognosçer por todo esto, mueren e despues van alla pena que es sin fin e los tales commo estos si bien parasen mientes quando tienen bien, mas se les valdria cognosçer a dios estonçe que non padesçer despues.

19. c. e e.

XXXI

Enxienplo delas Abejas conlos Escarauacos

(*fol. 182v*) Las abejas vna uega conbidaron alos escarauacos a yantar. E despues que la messa fue puesta, asentaronse los escarauacos a comer e vinieron las abejas e pusieron mucha miel e muchas flores enla messa. E llos escarauacos comieron poca miel e fueronse luego. E otro dia conbidaron los escarauacos alas abejas e despues que fue puesta la messa e las abejas asentadas, posieron los escarauacos estiercol de bueys e de bestias. E las abejas non quisieron prouar punto dello, antes fueron su camino.

E las abejas se entienden porlos doctores dela iglesia e porlos onbres santos que conbidan alos onbres malos e pecadores e danles miel e flores a comer que se entienden por que los predican los mandamientos de nuestro Señor e dela ley que son mas dulçes que miel e les muestran commo se quiten de pecados, mas los malos poco o nada toman dello. Si llos mallos conbidan alguna vez allos buenos, danles de comer estiercol de bestias, que se entiende [por] palabras suçias e mallas obras e beodeçes e garganterias, ansi que los buenos e los justos non toman tales costunbres mas antes se van. Otrosi muchos onbres eneste mundo se enbeodan algunas vezes o [co]men mas de su derecho o faze[n] algunas cosas que non son (*fol. 183r*) de façer, por tal que [non] sean tenidos por escasos o por façer lo que fazen otros commo ellos. Onde diçe Sant Agustin: Por tal que yo non fuesse apartado delos otros, convieneme a ser mas mallo que quisiera. E dize Seneca: Con tales toma conpania que entiendas que te podra[n] façer mejor o que entiendas que tomaras delos buenas costunbres; e atales resçibe entu casa que puedas façer mejor[es] en tirar de mala carera.

1. L. ouejas—7. della—17. a. que s.—19. que non son repeated—24. t. te d.

Herlet, *op. cit.*, p. 35.

---

1. *uega* for *uegada*. Cf. *ferra* for *ferrada*, XIV, l. 7, and note.

20. Cf. Augustine, *Confessiones*, Bk. II, chap. iii: *Ego, ne uituperarer, uiciosior fiebam.*

24. Latin: *illos admitte quos tu potes facere meliores.* Cf. *Comedia de Calisto e Melibea* (ed. Foulché-Delbosc, Barcelona, 1900), p. 34.

XXXII

Enxienplo del Asno conel Onbre Bueno

Vn onbre bueno tenia un asno ensu casa e fizolo yr a llabrar. E aquel onbre bueno [tenia] un puerco e era çerca dela San Martin, e porque venia açerca el tienpo para lo matar, daualo bien a comer, somas e berças e farina. E desque auia comido, yuase luego a echar a dormir. El asno desque uio esto pensso luego entressi: Este puerco mui bien le va. El come bien e bebe bien e non trabaja commo yo nin come mal commo yo. Mas bien se yo que fare. Fazerme he doliente e quiza que me faran tanto bien commo al puerco. E fizolo ansi. Tendiose enel stablo e entro su dueño alla e desque lo fallo tendido, començolo a menazar que se lleuantase, mas el non se quiso lleuantar, antes començo a jemir. E su señor pessole mucho e dixo asu muger: El nuestro asno esta doliente. E dixo la muger: Pues que ansi es, demosle a comer, pan e farina e de buen agua. E fiçieronlo ansi e el asno (*fol. 183v*) comio muy poco e dende adelante yuase fartando en manera que engroso mucho. Estonçe dixo el asno entresi: Agora he yo buen sino. E desi quando el puerco fue bien gruesso, vino el tienpo de se matar el puerco. El asno desque uio que matauan el puerco e quel daua el carniçero conel destral, el asno des[que] uio este fue mucho marauillado e ouiendo mui grand miedo, cuidando que farian eso mesmo ael lo que fiçieron al puerco, pues estaua gordo, e dixo entresi mesmo: Çierta mente mas quiero trabajar e façer tal vida commo primero que non morir tal muerte commo morio el puerco. Estonçe salio dela stablia e fuese saltando delante su señor. Quando el señor vio esto, tornolo al su primero ofiçio e murio el asno despues buena muerte.

El puerco se entiende porlos rricos que se uisten bien en este mundo e comen bien e beuen mejor e non se quieren trabajar en este mundo. Estos son los clerigos que non quieren seruir a dios e los usureros que non quieren ganar porsu trabajo si non porsu vsura. Estos tales son

1. u. puerco a. e. (puerco dotted underneath)—8. puerpo—17. guel—18. m. (qu with tilde, erased) c.—26. u. o (with tilde) n.

Herlet, *op. cit.*, pp. 16–18.
Chauvin, *op. cit.*, Vol. III, p. 51.

2. *dela San Martin. fiesta* has been omitted as in the French *la Saint Martin.* For the genitive case in Old Spanish nouns, cf. Diez, *Gram.*, Vol. III, pp. 865 f.; also Pidal, *El Dialecto leonés*, pp. 57 f. During the Middle Ages it was the almost universal custom in Europe to kill and salt the winter's supply of meat on Martinmas day; cf. Hone, *Every Day Book*, Vol. I (London, 1888), p. 735. The Spanish has a well-known proverb: *llegarle á uno su San Martin.* Cf. Cervantes, *Don Quixote* (ed. Clenencin), Vol. VI (Madrid, 1839), p. 295.

9. *començolo a menazar.* There are two other possibilities: *començolo amenazar* or *començolo [a] amenazar.*

17. *quel.* The only similar case of enclisis in this text occurs in XXXVI, l. 8.

18. *ouiendo.* For gerunds built on the perfect stem, cf. Pietsch, *Disticha Catonis* (Chicago, 1902), p. 41.

lamados puercos, los quales puercos çuenta enel euuangelio que entra el diablo enellos e fazellos afogar enla mar. Estos talles afoga el diablo eneste mundo por pecado e despues enla amargura del infierno. El asno se entiende por algunos onbres justos que estan ensus estudios o algunos ordenados (*fol. 184r*) ensus çeldas o algunos que viuen en lazeria eneste mundo o seruiendo a dios. Mas les valle atales commo estos que con lazeria o con trabajo vayan a parayso que non fagan commo los puercos e vayan al infierno, que les den conel destral de condenaçion enla cabeça. Aquestos que non quieren trabajar commo deuen nin seruir a dios segun deuen de façer, estos tales non seran tormentados conlos onbres mas conlos diablos. Dize Ysayas: Poresto enbia nuestro Señor, dios de vestes, ensus logreros, fanbre.

32. -nados repeated—34. lazerio—38. P. enbiara n. s. d. su veste en logar dos semejantes ati.

28. Matt. 8:28; Marc. 5:1; Luc. 8:26.
37. Ps. 72:5.
38. Is. 10:16: *Propter hoc mittet Dominator, Dominus exercitum, in pinguibus ejus tenuitatem.*

XXXIII

ENXIENPLO DELA GALINA CONEL MILLANO

La galina muchas vegadas lieua sus polos solas alas, mayor mente quando vey el millano. Acaesçio vna vez que vino el milano bolando sobre los polos e lla galina llamolos a todos, ansi que uenieron e metieronse todos sola galina sinon vno que fallo vn gujano e començolo de picar por comerlo. E uino el milano e lleuose el pollo.

Bien ansi faze nuestro Señor que nos llama, commo quando auemos pecado que corramos e nos pongamos solas allas. Esto faze porque nos arrepintamos e nos guardemos de fazer mal. Mas muchos dello[s], aun que veyen andar el diablo bolandoençima dellos, non quieren fuyr, mas antes se llegan al gusano del diablo. Pues hermanos, nos otros fuyamos allas allas del cruçifixo e leguemosnos ael por penssamiento de buenas obras, doliendonos dela su pasion o faziendo (*fol. 184 v*) los sus mandamientos, e allegandonos ansi ael seremos saluos.

4. g. e vino vno e f.—6. S. antes q.—10. a. bufano d.

Herlet, *op. cit.*, p. 36.

4. Latin: *excepto uno qui inuenit uermiculum*, etc.

XXXIV

ENXIENPLO DEL LEON CONEL GATO

Vna vegada conbido el leon a todas las animalias a comer e conbido al gato que era su amigo e era onbre muy onrrado. E pregunto el leon que de que vianda comia mas de grado. E el rrespondio: Rratos e mures. E pensso el leon, que pues el gato se pagaua delo, que le[s]

daria [a] comer de aquella vianda a todos los otros, ansi que fiço traer muchos manjares de rratos e de mures, ansi que el gato comio muy bien dellos mas todos los otros començaron a murmurar e fablar entresi: Que es esto que nos da a comer? E por esto fue el ayantar menos preçiado e abiltado.

Ansi es de muchos que façen muchos conbites e acaesçelos que conbidan algunos gatos, que se entienden por algunos onbres que non se pagan de ningun plaçer sinon de deçir algunas suçiedades por auer la graçia de algunos o por lleuar algo, o que les plega o non fazer aquella gran fiesta. E usan ansi fazer fasta la muerte e por tal que se pueden eneste mundo enbeodar e ynchir los vientres de vianda e [veuir] en suçiedades e en pecados e dar las animas alos diablos.

6. gata—14. E uso a.

Herlet, *op. cit.*, pp. 35, 36.

13. Latin: *omnes tam uolentes quam nolentes retinet usque ad noctem, ut omnes possit inebriare, uentrem implere potu et animam Diabulo (sic).* Our Latin text is not followed very closely here.

XXXV

Enxienplo del Ansar conel Cueruo

Vn ansar mui gorda era mui pesada e rrogo al cueruo que la ayudase que podiese bolar mejor e mas alto, estonçe que podria ver las alturas del mundo e dellos montes e delos (*fol. 185r*) aruoles. El cueruo ayudola quanto pudo e firmo los pies en tierra por la ayudar a bolar al ansar mejor. Mas el ansar peso tanto que el cueruo non pudo façer nada. E dixo el ansar al cueruo: Por que non me lleuantas e non me façes bolar? Rrespondio el cueruo: Quanto mas me esfuerço para te sobir, tanto te façes tu pessada.

Otrosi vn pecador fuese vna vegada a confesar a un onbre santo e rrogole que pidiese de merçet anuestro Señor que el porla su santa piedad llo quissiese partir de aquellos pecados enque andaua. El onbre bueno rrogo a dios porel e a cabo de vn año tornose el onbre pecador al onbre santo e dixole: Señor, non siento que las tus oraçiones me fazen pro ninguna, que tanto pecador me siento commo suelo e el mi coraçon tan enbuelto sta en pecado commo suele. E dixole el onbre santo: Amigo, ven comigo. Ellos fueronse amos y dos e fallaron enel camino vn saco lleno de trigo que cayera de vna bestia. E dixo el justo al pecador: Toma de ay. E echan amos mano del saco e el pecador esforçauasse de lleuantar el saco e el justo tiraualo contra tierra quanto podia. El peca-

1. c. gela a.—3. los repeated—15. fuele

Herlet, *op. cit.*, p. 36. Chauvin, *op. cit.*, Vol. III, p. 103.

14. *suelo.* For the present of this verb with a past significance, cf. Gaspary, *Die sicilianische Dichterschule* (Berlin, 1878), pp. 226 f.

dor uiolo e dixolle: Señor, por que abaxas este saco contra tierra? E ansi faziendo nunca lleuantaremos el costal. E dixo el justo: Ansi me conteçe contigo, que pido merçet almi Señor Ihesu Christo porti e (*fol. 185v*) quierote leuantar pormis oraçiones mas tu sienpre tiras contra tierra, que siempre pecas mas. E si tu quisieses esforçarte comigo e partirte de algun pecado, entrenos amos poderte yamos façer yr a parayso.

Mas si llos onbres penssasen eneste mundo que cosa es e commo non es otra cosa sinon sueño, que vn onbre pobre que se duerma e se sueñe muy rrico, quando despierta mas triste esta que non si se soñase pobre. Otrosi un onbre rrico que se sueñe pobre, quando despierta esta muy allegre porque se falla rrico. Ansi es en este mundo que los onbres que son pobres e son buenos, espi[en]den su tienpo en seruiçio de dios; e quando van a paraysso, fallanse muy rricos e muy bien andantes. Otrosi aquellos que son rricos e muy bien andantes eneste mundo non quieren fazer al sinon aquello que es seruiçio del cuerpo. E despues mueren e van al infierno. Aquellos son mas mal andantes que otros onbres.

Otrosi semejante es en este mundo dellos juegos del axedrez, que allos [vnos] llaman duques e allos otros llaman rreys e allos otro[s] caualleros e allos otros peonis. E llos onbres juegan conellos e ansi aquel que vençe, aquel es tenido por mejor. Mas despues que han jugado conellos, tornanlles alla bolsa muy desonrrada mente, que alas vezes cae deyuso el rrey e los condes e los peones desuso.

E bien ansi es delos onbres que todos vienen de vn padre e de vna madre, de Adam (*fol. 186r*) e de Eua. E despues juegan los vnos conlos otros. El vno gana, el otro pierde e el que puede vençer al otro, aquel es tenido por mejor. Mas despues son puestos sin rregla enla bolssa, que se entiende [por]los cuerpos enllos lozilos e las animas enlos infiernos donde non han ordenamiento ninguno mas espanto sin fin. E aunque vayan a parayso, avezes van los que son eneste mundo menores delante los mayores e delante los rreys e delante los señores en aquella corte tan noble que deuian cobdiçiar los onbres ser enella mas onrrados, alli quieren yr mas deshonrrados, commo quier que bien aventurado sera aquel que yra alla, ca el que en paraysso menos bien touiere, terna mas que nunca podria meresçer a dios.

34. fallasen—36. o. semejantes e.—42. d. vna parte e—43. Adam repeated.—44. v. ganaua e. o. perdia e.

26. A comparison can easily be drawn between the ideas here expressed and those uttered by Segismundo in his famous soliloquy. Cf. Calderon, *La Vida es Sueño* (ed. Krenkel, *Klassische Bühnendichtungen der Spanier*), Vol. I (Leipzig, 1881), p. 116. The *Barlaam and Josaphat* was probably the common ultimate source of the two authors. Cf. Krenkel, *op. cit.*, p. 15, for a discussion of Calderon's indebtedness to the *Barlaam and Josaphat*.

38. *peonis*. Final *i* for *e*, *is* for *es*, is a peculiarity of the Asturian: Pidal, *El dialecto leonés*, pp. 25, 26; Munthe, *Anteckningar om Folkmålet i en trakt af vestra Asturien* (Upsala, 1887), p. 20. Cf. XLV, l. 2.

XXXVI

Enxienplo del Millano conllas Perdiçes

El millano vna vegada miraua sus allas e sus pies e sus vñas e desque se ouo mirado, dixo entresi: Yo tan bien armado so commo el falcon e commo el aguila e tales allas e tales vñas e tales pies he. Por que non tomare las perdiçes ansi commo ellos? E fue buscar vn lugar do auia muchas perdiçes e tomo delas e puso dos solas allas, dos solos pies e la quinta enel pico fasta que las non pudo tener e ouollas a dexar todas. E poresto diçe enel prouerbio: Quien todo lo quiere, todo lo pierde. E por aquelos diçe que nunca quiso trabajar en tomar perdiçes.

Herlet, *op. cit.*, p. 36.

---

7. Knust quotes from the *Disciplina clericalis*, XX, 9: *Qui totum voluit, totum perdidit.* One is also reminded of the morals to the fable of the dog with the meat. Cf. the version found in the *Romulus* (ed. Oesterley, Berlin, 1870), p. 41: *Sic quisquis alienum querit, dum plus uult, suum perdit.* In Odo's own version of this fable we find no similar moral. This proverb has been studied by Wagner, "The Sources of El Cavallero Cifar," *Rev. Hisp.*, Vol. X, p. 71.

The following is an inedited variant of the same story taken from the *Espejo de los legos*, MS 117, Biblioteca Nacional:

El milano quiso caçar vn dia e asecho vna manada de perdizes e echandose sobre ellas tomo vna conel pico e dos conlos pies e dos conlas alas. E gozandose de tamaña presa quisola tener toda con todo esforçamiento. E como estodiese de todo en todo afincado enla prea, vino el ballestero, el qual veyendo al (al) milano asi ocupado, firiolo dela saeta e matolo asi que el mesquino perdio la vida conla prea.

Tal es lo que es dicho enel xxxiii° Ysayas: Mal sera ati que rrobas, que tu seras rrobado, que quiere dezir: Seras presa del diablo. E dize enel xvii° de Jeremias: Fizo rriquezas e non en juyzio. En medio delos sus dias las desanparara. Este milano es cada vno entiendiente a ganaçias non derech-(m)eras. El sagitario es Dios, la prea los bienes del siglo, la saeta la muerte. E es a saber que este sagitario, [que] non [pue]de saber mas de sabiduria, lança a vegadas la saeta delante del termino, que quiere dezir del pecador, firiendo al padre o ala madre o alguno mas viejo; alas vegadas aquende el termino, conviene saber firiendo al fijo o ala fija o a qualquier mas mançebo; alas vegadas dela parte diestra del termino, firiendo al hermano o ala hermana e alas vegadas dela parte siniestra, firiendo al vezino o ala vezina. E por ende aconsejo el psalmista diziendo: Si acresçentaren las rriquezas non quierades poner el coraçon enellas. Mas por que estendio el su arco? Lo aparejo segund el dize, conviene saber, para ferir. Mas non es sabido quando.

12. s. non de non s.—18. n. quitades.

7. Isa. 33:1. 9. Jer. 17:11. 18. Ps. 61:11.

XXXVII

Enxienplo dela Gulpeja conel Gato

(*fol. 186v*) La gulpeja vna vegada yua por un camino. Encontro al gato e dixole: Amigo, quantas maestrias sabes? E rrespondio el gato: Non se sinon vna. E dixo la gulpeja: Qual? Dizo el gato: Quando

los canes me van [en pos] por alcançar, subome enlos arboles altos. E dixo el gato ala gulpeja: E tu, quantas sabes? Dixo la gulpeja: Diez e siete e aun tengo vn saco lleno. E si quisieres, ven comigo e mostrarte he todas mis maestrias, que los canes non te puedan tomar. E al gato plugule mucho e otorgogelo e fueronse amos en vno. Ellos que se fueron, oyeron llos lladridos dellos perros e delos caçadores. E dixo el gato: Amigo, oyo los perros e he gran miedo que nos alcançen. E dixo la gulpeja: Non quieras auer miedo, ca yo te amostrare muy bien commo puedas escapar dellos. E ellos fablando, yuansse açercando los canes e llos caçadores. Çierta mente, dixo el gato, non quiero yr mas contigo. Mas quiero vsar demi arte. Estonçe el gato salto en vn arbol e los canes que uieron estar el gato enel arbol dexaronle e fueron en pos dela gulpeja e ssiguieronla tanto fasta que la alcançaron. E el vn perro porlas piernas, e el otro porel espinaço, el otro por la cabeça, començaronla de despedaçar. Estonçes començo dar bozes el gato que estaua enl[o] alto: Gulpeja, abre tu saco de todas tus maestrias, ca non te ualdran nada.

Porel (*fol. 187r*) gato se entiende[n] los simples e llos buenos que non saben vsar sinon de verdad e de seruir a dios e façer obras para sobir al çiello. E porla gulpeja se entiende[n] bozeros e los abogados o otros onbres de mala verdad que saben façer diez e siete engaños e mas un saco lleno. E despues viene la muerte que lieua a todos, tan bien a justos commo a pecadores. El onbre justo salta enel arbol que se entiende porlos çielos. E llos engañosos e los malos son tomados delos diablos e lleuados allos infiernos. Estonçe puede deçir el justo: Gulpeja, gulpeja, abre el costal! Ca todos tus engaños non te podrian guaresçer delos diablos. Dize Ihesu Christo enel euuangelio: Qui se ensalça sera humillado e quien se humilla sera ensalçado. Qual quier que en este mundo quisiere ser onrrado con soberuia o con pecado, en aquel otro mundo sera abaxado. E aquellos que eneste mundo se quisieren humillar porsu amor, seran enel otro mundo ensalçados enla gloria del paraysso.

21. por el repeated—22. saber—23. o por o.—29. c. con t.

Herlet, *op. cit.*, pp. 25, 26.
Chauvin, *op. cit.*, Vol. III, p. 54.
Köhler, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 534.
Espejo de los legos (ed. Gayangos, *op. cit.*), p. 445.

---

4. The Latin *insequor* is in other places translated *yr en pos*. Cf. l. 15.

5. The number of the fox's tricks varies with the MSS. The best make the number 17. The Arundel MS published by Oesterley stands alone in making the number 18. The Munich 8947 has 20, the same number we find in the Johannis de Schepeya and the *Espejo de los legos* versions,

18. There is only one other instance in the text where *començar* takes the infinitive directly. Cf. *começo decir*, LVII, l. 22; Meyer-Lübke, *Gram.*, Vol. III, p. 429, and Fitzgerald, *Versification of the Cuaderna Vía*, p. 51.

30. Cf. Matt. 23:12, Luc. 14:11 and 18:14.

XXXVIII

Enxienplo del Cueruo conla Paloma

Vna vegada furto el cueruo vn fijo a una paloma. E la paloma fuese al nido del cueruo e rrogole que le quisiese dar ssu fijo. E dixo el cueruo ala paloma: Sabes cantar? E rrespondio la paloma: Si, mas non bien. E dixo el cueruo: Pues canta. La paloma començó a cantar e dixo el cueruo ala palloma: Canta mejor. Si non, non te dare tu fijo. E dixo la paloma: Ve, en verdad non se mejor cantar. Estonçe el cueruo e la cuerua (*fol. 187v*) comieron al fijo dela paloma.

El cueruo se entiende porlos onbres onrrados e poderosos e merinos e alcaldes, que toman los bueys o llas ouejas o, a las vegadas, algunos heredamientos de algunos onbres simples e ponenles que han fecho algun mal por dar rrazon a llo que ellos fazen o porque los onbres non gelo tengan a mal. Viene el onbre simple a demandale el buey o lla oueja o lla tierra e rruegale que lo de, e gele dara porello veynte maravedis o mas segun su poder. Rresponde el soberuio: Da mas, que si mas non das, non lo lleuaras el peño. E rrespondio el bueno: En verdad non lo tengo, ca soy pobre e menguado e non uos lo podria dar. Estonçe el otro o tiene el peño o lo faze mal andante por despecho que lo demanda. Ansi que estragan los rricos allos pobre[s] mesquinos.

9. l. bienes o—10. ponerles—17. o. si t.

Herlet, *op. cit.*, p. 21.

---

3. Latin: *Scio, sed minus bene.* Either *si* or *se* would be a good translation.

9. Latin: *capiunt bouem uel oues.* Cf. also l. 9.

13. *Veynte maravedis* translates *V solidos.* Without knowing precisely the time and place where the translation was made, it is impossible to fix the exact value of the maravedí. As to the fluctuations of this coin's value, cf. *Fuero de Salamanca* (ed. Ruano, Salamanca, 1870), p. 114; also Burke, *History of Spain*, Vol. II (London, 1900), pp. 281 f. Of course the maravedí is too old a coin to aid us in fixing the date of the *Gatos* translation.

17. Latin: *uel pignus retinet uel aliter affligit*, etc.

The following inedited version of the fable is taken from *El espejo de los legos*, Biblioteca Nacional MS 117:

El cueruo vna vegada por calopnia rrobo el pollo dela paloma e leuolo al su nido e vino la paloma rrogando que le diesse su pollo. E dixo el cueruo: Si lo quieres aver, canta. E canto quanto ssopo e dixo el cueruo: Canta mejor. Ca non me plaze este canto. E dixo la paloma: Çierto non puedo mejor cantar. E assi el cueruo e ssu muger tragaron el pollo. Asi es de los bayles injustiosos, los quales tomando el buey o la vaca del pobre con rrazon o sin rrazon, non los dan fasta que ssean quitados asu voluntat.

XXXIX

Enxienplo dela Abobilla conel Rruy Señor

La abobila que es pintada de muchas colores e muy bien crestada dixo al Ruy Señor: Amigo, toda la noche andas cantando e saltando porlos arboles e nunca quedas. Ven comigo e folgaras vn poco enmi nio. El

1. *muchas colores.* *Color* is still sometimes used in the feminine. Cf. Cuervo, *Notas*, p. 38. Cervantes uses both genders. Cf. Cejador y Frauca, *La lengua de Cervantes*, Vol. (Madrid, 1905), p. 160.

otorgogelo e descendio al nio del abobilla, mas tanto ollia de mal porel esstiercol que era y que non lo pudo endurar e fuese su camino deziendo: Mas quiero porlos arboles duros saltar toda la noche que non morar ental lugar.

El abubilla que faze el nido enel estiercol significa la mala muger e los onbres luxuriosos (*fol. 188r*) que algunas vegadas han lechos e puestos e blando[s], mas fiedenles muy mal porel pecado. El Ruy Señor que anda porlas rramas se entiende porlos onbres o porlas mujeres que viuen enlos asperos mandamientos de rreligion e orando a dios enlas oras dela noche loando e bendiziendo el su nonbre. Aquestos tales mas cobdiçian estar en tales arboles e cantar que non podresçer enel nido del estiercol del pecado.

9. -osos, repeated—10. b. e m. vyenen—14. n. paresçer e.

Herlet, *op. cit.*, p. 36.

3. *nio.* For an example of *nio* in rhyme with *judio*, cf. the Rabbi Sem Tob as quoted by the Marques de Santillana, *Obras* (ed. Amador de los Ríos, Madrid, 1853), p. 14.

9. Latin: *qui quandoque habent lectos ornatos et suaues cum stercore culpe fetidissimos.*

14. Latin: *in fetore luxurie computrescere.*

XL

ENXIENPLO DEL FRAYRE

Vn frayre lego en vn monesterio aquien el diablo tentaua de muchas tentaçiones en guisa que una noche dexo el abito ensu monesterio dentro enel dormitorio e yuase fuera del monesterio e por dexar la orden. E acaesçio que ouo de passar porla yglesia e pasando por y, començo de catar el cruçifixo e dixo: Commo, Señor, yo vine aqui de buen coraçon por [te] seruir e tu agora dexasme lleuar allos diablos que son tus enemigos? Mas çierta mente non sera ansi, que yo te yre abraçar e de guissa te abraçare e te apertare que si el diablo ami quisiere lleuar que lieue ati comigo. Estonçe fue abraçar el cruçifixo muy rreçia mente e partieronse todas las tentaçiones del que nunca jamas las ouo e finco enla orden e fue despues muy santo onbre.

E si los onbres o las mugeres que son eneste mundo que estan (*fol. 188v*) en algun pecado fiçiesen quanto podiesen por se partir del ansi commo fiço el frayre, luego los diablos se partiran dellos assi commo fizieron del frayre. Mas en lugar de façer quanto podieren por arredrar el diablo, antes fazen quanto pueden por se allegar al pecado en muchas guisas e muchas maneras.

2. tentationes—5. cantar—10. j. lo o.—16. d. ansi f.

1. I assume an anacoluthon in the first sentence. It can be made grammatical by inserting *era* or *auia* after *lego.*

The following very similar story is taken from *El espejo de los legos*, Biblioteca Nacional, MS 117:

Recuenta Odo de Sericon que un onbre temptado de luxuria, commo non pudiesse partirse dela temptaçion, fuxo ala iglesia e echose delante el cruçifixo e dixo: Señor, pequeña tierra tengo deti, la qual mis enemigos me quieren tirar. Ahe yo tela do. Defiendela. E assi la temptaçion aquedo assi que pudo dezir aquello del psalmo: Señor, tu eres mi fermidunbre e mi rrefugio e mi aguardador.

5. m. ser mi d unbre e.
Ps. 17:3: *Dominus firmamentum meum, et refugium meum, et liberator meus.*

XLI

Enxienplo delos Aldeanos

Dize que vnos aldeanos que auian de dar dineros asu señor, el plazo venia muy açerca que los auian de pagar e si non los pagasen, cayan en muy gran pena contra su señor. E dixeron entresi: Que faremos? que el tienpo es muy çerca. Non fallaremos mandadero que pudiese alla legar [a] aquel tienpo? Dixo vno: Yo vos dire que faremos. La liebre es muy lijera e pongamosla los dineros e en vna bolsa al pescueço e digamosla que los lieue apriesa alla corte de nuestro señor. E fizieronlo ansi commo lo auian dicho. E desque ouieron atados los dineros ala bolsa al pescueço dela liebre, fuese la liebre quanto pudo porel monte consu bolsa e consus dineros, ansi que los onbres nunca sopieron dela liebre que se fiziera.

E llos onbres se entienden por algunos grandes onbres e señores que veen alos sus onbres e allos sus vasallos muy pobres e muy lazadros e non les dan sinon muy poco delo suyo e dan alos estraños muy grandes dones e mucho [delo] suyo [e] vanse elos con (*fol. 189r*) los dineros e non saben donde nin donde non. E los [que] tormentan alos suyos [e los] fazen andar pobres son semejantes alla lima que gasta el fierro e los que crian allos suyos e les fazen algun bien son semejantes alla gallina que cria sus pollos. Otrosi fueron semejantes aquellos onbres que quando

15. m. s. an si delos que son (*fol. 189r*) que son l.—19. crian

Title: *aldeanos.* In the Corpus Christi MS *simplices Willebei.*
14–16. Latin: *extraneis largissime subueniunt. Et illi cum donis aufugiunt.* Cf. l. 26.
17. *lima.* Latin: *Similes sunt Lanie (sic), qui (sic) proprios filios laniat.* The *Lamia* is a fabulous monster commonly represented as having the head and breast of a woman. It preyed on human beings like a vampire. Cf. Harper, *Dictionary of Classical Literature and Antiquities* (New York, 1898), *s. v.*; also *Ein tosco-venezianischer Bestiarius* (ed. Goldstaub und Wendriner, Halle, 1892), p. 190, n. The mistake is undoubtedly due to the translator's failure to understand the word.
18. Latin: *Similes sunt Galline, que pullos anatis educat.*
19. The order of the two similitudes is reversed in the Corpus Christi MS.

vienen los demandadores de Sant Anton e Rronças Vales o de otros santos que les predican muchas mentiras e muchas trayçiones e prometenles que sacaran las animas desus padres de pena o a ellos quando alla fueren, lo qual ellos non pueden fazer. E llos onbres creen lo que les diçen verdad e danles muchos dones e enbian allos santos de aquelo que ellos an tomado. [Mas ellos con] aquello [que] les an dado suben ensus bestias e vanse muy lijera mente ansi que la liebre en manera que los que lo dan non saben que es dello nin dellos. E por uentura que aquela noche lo espienden commo non deuen. E poresto dice Sant Agustin: Dexarlo de dar alli donde [non] son çiertos e darlo alas yglesias que son vezinas e alos pobres envergonçados que sabes que lo a[n] menester, o a rreligiosos o a monesterios o si lo quieres dar en aquel lugar do as devoçion, e enbiarlo ala contu onbre. Mas non lo des [a] aquellos que son enemigos dela fe.

28. Dexanlo—30. saben.

20. The *chanoines régulaires de St. Antoine* were organized in 1070 A. D. for the purpose of aiding those afflicted with the disease known as St. Anthony's fire.

Rronças Vales is of course *Roncesvalles*. The monastery there was founded about 1163 as a refuge for pilgrims to Santiago de Compostela. It had the privilege of soliciting contributions throughout Christendom. The *questores de Hautepas* are also mentioned in the Latin.

25. Latin: *At illi cum oblatis equos ascendunt*, etc.

28. Latin: *Tene certum, dimitte incertum. Ele*[*e*]*mosinas da certis personis, uicinis tuis, pauperibus uerecundis quos nouisti indigere et maxime domisticis* (*sic*) *fidei.* The Spanish translation is very far removed from the original. Does *alli* represent the first two syllables of *allimosnas?* For the infinitive used as an imperative, cf. Cuervo, *Notas*, pp. 62 f.' and Diez, *Gram.*, Vol. III, p. 916.

XLII

Enxienplo delo que acaesçio alla Formiga conlos Puercos

(*fol. 189v*) La formiga coje e lieua los granos del trigo deque uiua enel inuierno e algunas vezes acaesçe que desque lo [a] allegado, vienen los puercos e comenjelo [e] estruyengelo todo.

Ansi es de muchos onbres eneste mundo que muchas vegadas non catan al si non allegar rriquezas e algos. E alas vegadas acaesçe que uienen los ladrones o los merinos o sus señores o parientes o otros algunos que son mas poderossos que non ellos e gelo çomen e destruyen todo, ansi que avran a dexar sus rriquezas a mal su grado.

1. d. t. desque, a mark looking like an "s" has been erased but it is doubtful—5. cantan.

XLIII

Enxienplo dela Muerte del Lobo

Acaesçio que murio el lobo e el leon fizo ayuntar todas las animalias e fizolo enterar muy onrrada mente. Lla liebre traya el agua bendita e

2. The animals mentioned and the duties assigned to them are somewhat different in the Corpus Christi MS: *Lupus* (*sic*) *aquam benedictam portauit, Hericii cereos portauerunt, Hyrci campanas pulsauerunt, Melotes foueam facerunt, Vulpes mortum in pheretro portauerunt, Berengarius, scilicet Vrsus missam celebrauit, Bos euangelium, Asinus epistolam legit.*

los cabrones trayan los çirios e la cabra tañia las canpañas e los eriços feçieron la fuesa [e la rrapossa traya el feretro e el oso celebro la misa] e el buey canto el euuangelio [e] el asno dixo el pistola. E despues que la missa fue cantada e el lobo fue enterrado, e delos bienes que dexo el lobo fizieron buen ayantar las animalias e fartaronse muy bien, e ansi que cobdiçiauan que dios les diesse otro tal cuerpo commo aquel.

Ansi acaesçe muchas vegadas que quando es muerto algun rrobador o algun logrero o algun onbre rrico que ha ganado lo suyo, comegelo el perllado o el abbad do es enterrado (*fol. 190r*) [e] façe llegar el conuento delas bestias que se entienden por algunos nesçios que viuen commo bestias. E muchas vegadas acaesçe que en vn conuento [d]e monjes negros o de blancos o en vna yglesia do avra muchos clerigos que non son sinon bestias que se entienden que dellos son lleones por grand argullo e llos otros son gulpejas por grand engaño e los otros son ossos por grand gortonia e los otros son cabrones por gran maldad e llos otros son asnos por gran pereça que son muy pereçosos por seruir a dios. E otros son eriços por aspereça que son sañudos e maninconiosos. E otros son liebres por miedo delo que non deue[n] auer [miedo]. Ca a[n] miedo de perder los bienes temporales deque non deuian de auer miedo [mas non an miedo de perder los bienes perdurables de] lo que cada vno deue temer. Otros son bueys por labrar las tierras, ca mas trabajan enllas cosas terreñales que non enllas spirituales. Esto[s] n[on son] los bueys [de] Habranhan [mas los] que conpro [aquel que] non quiso que fuese alla çena perdurable.

5. q. el epistola m., the last two words are dotted underneath except the final syllable la—11. -rrado repeated—façer—23. e. ellas c.—24, 25. b. que conpro H. e n. q.

Herlet, *op, cit.*, p. 29.

---

4. The insertion is required to justify l. 16 below.

5. *el pistola.* Probably a case of aphaeresis. However, the form *epistola* occurs in the rejected repetition (cf. variant). Many examples can be offered of the use of the masculine article where the initial *e* has been dropped before impure *s*. To mention but one, cf. *el spada sacada*, *El Libro de los exemplos* (ed. Gayangos), p. 509.

15. *argullo.* For the change of initial *o* to *a*, cf. Pidal, *Gram.*, 20, 3. Cf. Juan Ruiz, *El libro de buen amor* (ed. Ducamin), p. 192, where the form *argulloso* occurs, but in the Salamanca MS only. Ducamin stigmatizes it with a *sic*. Cf. XLVIII, ll. 6 and 17. In *La vida de Santa Maria Egipciaca* (ed. Janer), p. 311, occurs the form *ergullosa*.

16. *gortonia*, modern *glotonerta*.

19. *maninconiosos*, modern *melancólicos*. Cf. modern *manicomio*, which like the word in the text shows a more popular development. Cf. Ps. 13:5; 52:6.

21. Latin: *non timent amittere eterna ubi precipue timendum est.*

24. At this point there is some difference in the manuscript readings in the Latin. The Corpus Christi has it: *Hii non [sunt] boues Abrahe, sed quos emit qui ad cenam glorie uenire recusauit.* To this Hervieux remarks: *Ce passage visiblement altéré, semble avoir été mieux conservé dans AS* (Arras MS 184) *qui porte: Hii non sunt boues Abrahe quos emit Deus, sed ursi Diaboli qui ad cenam glorie uenire recusant.* The Arundel MS 292 published by Oesterley gives still another reading. After a careful study, however, it is plain to me that the Corpus Christi here, as in so many other cases, offers the better reading. In fact this reading is entirely accurate after the insertion of the word *sunt*, and Hervieux is wrong

Ende diçe Michaeas: El que bueno es, derecho es commo palma; entrelos monjes espina. Ansi acaesçe muchas vezes que sera grand conpaña de monjes o gran congregaçion de clerigos e mall a bes sera fallado entre ellos vn justo. E aquel que mejor es entre ellos espina commo [palma] o commo cardo.

26. d. San Matheo: E.—29, 30. e. comio o comio cardo.

both in supposing the reading to be corrupt and in thinking the Arras reading a better one. I take, then, the Corpus Christi reading and emend the Spanish in accordance with it. For the allusion to the oxen of Abraham, cf. Gen. 15:9 and 21:27. The phrase *boues Abrahe* is again used by Odo in Fable LXVIII: *De asino et leone: Vtimam simus boues Abrahe uel asini qui pascuntur iuxta boues.* Job [1:14]. Cf. Hervieux, *op. cit.*, Vol. IV, p. 241. For the allusion to the feast, cf. Luc. 14:16-19. The thought seems to be that the oxen sacrificed by Abraham were devoted to spiritual ends, whereas those of the guest who refused to attend the feast merely tilled the soil. The word *perdurable* in the Spanish is probably due to a failure to appreciate the allusion and a consequent misconception. Is the name Abraham due to a corruption of the word *arabant* in the passage quoted from Job?

26. Mich. 7:4: *Qui optimus in eis est, quasi paliurus, et qui rectus, quasi spina de sepe.* The passage in the *Gatos* is very corrupt. It would be easy to make it conform to the original; but the confusion is probably due, not to the scribe, but to the translator, who apparently did not understand *paliurus*, which he translated by *palma*, if indeed the error did not already exist in his Latin MS. This one error might easily lead him to alter the sense of the whole passage. In l. 27 I take *espina* to be a verb, as it evidently is in l. 29, where it translates *stimulat.*

29. For the sake of consistency I make the missing word *palma.*

XLIV

ENXIENPLO DEL PERRO CONEL JUNCO

(*fol. 190v*) Acaesçio vna vegada que el perro que se aparto a una mata de juncos por mear e vn junco picole detras ansi que el perro ssalto vn gran salto e parose a llexos a lladrar. E dixo el junco: Mas quiero que ladres siendo a llexos demi que non que me ensuzies seyendo açerca demi.

Bien ansi mejor es echarlos allos mallos e llocos desu conpania commo quier que les den bozes o profaçan o digan algunas falsedades con gran engaño; mejor es que non ser otros ensuziados porsu conpania.

Herlet, *op. cit.*, p. 36.

XLV

ENXIENPLO DEL VNICORNIO

Vn vnicornio yua en pos de vn onbre por lo alcançar. El onbre que se yua fuyendo, fallo vn arbol e so aquel arbol auia vn foyo de serpientis e de sapos e de muchos llaços. Enlla rrays de aquel arbol auia dos gujanos, el vno blanco e el otro prieto que non façian [al] sinon rroer el arbol. E el onbre que stauaençima del mançano comiendo delas mançanas tomava muy gran plaçer enllas fojas que le paresçian muy

fermossas. El que staua enesto, e que los gujanos derriban el arbol. El onbre cayo eneste foyo do eran aquellas serpientes e mataronle todas.

El vnicornio se entiende porla muerte dela qual ninguno non puede scapar. El arbol es el mundo. Las mançanas son los plaçeres que el onbre ha eneste mundo en comer, en beber, en fermossas mugeres. Las fojas son las palabras apuestas que los onbres diçen o los (*fol. 191r*) fermossos paños que uisten. Los dos gujanos que rroen el arbol son los dias e las noches que consumen todo el mundo. El onbre mesquino e loco tomando plaçer enestas mançanas non para mientes asi mesmo fasta que caya enla foya del infierno do ha muchos lazos e tormentos para tormentar alos onbres mesquinos sin fin.

8. l el written over an n or beginning of an m—12. o los twice repeated —14. e las, repeated—15. l. non t.

Herlet, *op. cit.*, p. 36.
Chauvin, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 85; Vol. III, p. 99.
Kalila et Digna (ed. Allen), p. 16.

XLVI

Enxienplo dela Gulpeja conel Marinero

La gulpeja vna vegada queria pasar vna grand agua en vna naue. E dixo al barquero que la pasase alende e que lo pagaria bien el alquiler dela naue. El marinero pasola allende e desi dixo que pagase lo que auia puessto conel. Dixo la gulpeja: Yo te pagare. E mojo la cola e diole conella porlos rrostros. E dixo estonçes el barquero: Muy mal galardon me das porque te pase enel barco el agua.

Por esto diçe el prouerbio: Quien mal señor sirue, todo su seruiçio pierde. Ansi acaesçe que los que siruen al diablo que por muchos seruiçios que le sienpre fagan, siempre les da galardon malo. E si non gelo da eneste mundo, dagelo enel otro, que los lieua al infierno.

2. e gelo p.—9. dan.

Herlet, *op. cit.*, pp. 27 f.

The Latin of this proverb is: *Qui malo seruit, seruicium suum perdit.* Voigt (*op. cit.*, p. 128) gives a reference to Anonymus Neveleti XXVII, vs. 17: *Se misere seruire sciat, qui seruit iniquo.* I can add several variants taken from the aforementioned *Proverbia Magistri Serlonis* (ed. Meyer. *Archives des missions scientifiques*, Paris, 1868), p. 177. *Sun tens pert ki fullun sert. Nil homo profecit qui nequicie benefecit. Hoc amisisti quod iniquis exhibuisti. Pravis obsequere, perdita spes opere.* Cf. also *Poema del Cid* (ed. Pidal, Madrid, 1900), l. 850; Juan Ruiz, *El libro de buen amor* (ed. Ducamin), copla 1366; *quien amal ome sirue, sienprel sera mendigo*, etc. In copla 1476 the moral is very similar to that of this fable.

XLVII

Enxienplo del Ximio

El ximio come el meollo de qualquier arbol que ssea dulçe mas quando quier comer la nuez verde e lle amarga la corteça deençima (*fol. 191v*),

2. *quier*, cf. Pidal, *El dialecto leonés*, p. 51; *Gram.*, 28, 3.

dexa el meolo e echa la nuez desi porque la falla la corteça amarga. Non para mientes commo el meolo de dentro es saboroso.

Bien ansi es de muchos locos eneste mundo que les es graue cosa de fazer aquellas cosas que son a seruiçio de dios e alos sus mandamientos e non paran mientes que aquellos [por non] façer eneste mundo las cossas que les paresçen que son amargas que despues que les es ascondido el gozo dela vida perdurable. E por aquesta amargura, ca non quiere[n] ayunar nin vellar nin sofrir otra alguna amargura, pierde[n] la dulçura dela vida perdurable. Ende diz San Gregorio: El loco mas quiere sienpre ser captiuo que non sufrir algun trabajo algun poco de tienpo.

3. p. gela f.—5. m. legos e.

Exempla of Jacques de Vitry (ed. Crane, London, 1890), p. 188.

5. Latin: *de stolidis hominibus*, etc.

The following inedited variant of this story is from the *Espejo de los legos*, MS 94, Biblioteca Nacional:

La ximia de buena uoluntad come el meollo dela nues, mas quando siente la amargura dela corteza, echa toda la nuez. E asi fazen los apostatos que por poca dureza de religion echan la dulçedunbre dela alegria çelestial. Los tales son semejables al gato que de buena uoluntad come el pes mas non quiere pescar.

XLVIII

ENXIENPLO DEL CARACOL

El caracol lieua sienpre su casa ençima desu espinaço e poresto anda poco e pequeñas jornadas.

Aqueste significa allos señores o allos onbres muy rricos o alos perllados que, quando andan camino, van con carretas e con grandes baxillas de plata e van con toda su casa por do quier que andan muy soberuia mente e con muy grand argullo e poress[to lleg]an tarde [a] parayso e por todas las rriquezas que ouieres, non querades poner vuestros coraçones enellas. E dize el aposstol: Non deue ser desechadas las rriquezas con que paguemos el rreyno delos çiellos. E diçe San Pablo en (*fol. 192r*) vna epistola: Los que quieren ser rricos eneste mundo caen en muchas tentaçiones e en muchos lazos del diablo. Non aborreçe el apostol las rriquezas mas el mal e el pecado que dellas viene, que creçe allos onbres conlas soberuias, que quando el rrico [se] vee aconpañado de grandes

2. juarnados—6, 7, 8. e por esspantar deparayso e por todos los que ouieres rriquezas n. q. p. v. c. enellos—9. en repeated—11. aborreçen—12. creçen not plain. Looks like creen

6. Latin: *Et ideo tarde ueniunt ad Paradisum.*

7. Ps. 61:11: *Diuitiae si affluant, nolite cor apponere.*

8. What follows is not ascribed to the apostol in the Latin but to a saint: *Ideo dicit Sanctus.* A variant reads *sacerdos.*

10. I Tim. 6:9.

13. Latin: *Quoniam uidet diues se magna familia stipatum*, etc.

conpañas e vee que tiene mucha vaxilla de plata e muchos cauallos, cresçenlle conello soberuia[s]. Aqueste es [el] gujano delas rriquezas. Commo el gujano rroe el arbol enel enxienplo antes dicho, lo derriba, bien ansi derriba la sobueruia a altos onbres e allos argullosos en tanto que caen enel pozo del infierno. Muchos son eneste mundo que han rriquezas mas non las aman nin las preçian nada nin tienen el coraçon en otra cosa sinon commo las podran partir alos pobres.

Mas, el caracol saca los dos cuernos. Quando le tañe alguna paja o alguna espina el cuerno, torna los cuernos alla cabeça.

Ansi es delos obispos que traen mitras cornudas. E si lles uiene alguna tribulaçion luego tornan los cuernos e fuyen. E alas vegadas ascondense ensus posadas e non difienden asus posadas nin las quieren defender e llas possadas defenden aellos.

14. veen—15. cresçenlles—16. a. que e.—21. c. sacados los c.

21. Latin: *Item Testudo duo cornua erigit*, etc.

XLIX

Enxienplo del Arraña conla Mosca

(*fol. 192v*) Ell araña quando esta ensu tela, viene la mosca asu tela e sale ell araña muy ayrada mente e mata la mosca. Mas quando viene la bispa façiendo rroydo, entrase el araña fuyendo asu forado.

Ansi es delos obispos o de otros perllados algunos que son eneste mundo, que quando algun pobre o algun baxo les façe algun enojo, o por ventura que lo acusan algunos que lo quieren mal, falsa mente tomanle a priessa quanto ha e comenselo. Mas quando algun poderoso o algun rrico los menaza, estonçe se asconden los obispos o los perlados. Onde: Stando fablando Efraym, ouieron grand espanto los de Israel, que se entiende: menazando el rrico o el poderoso, a grand miedo el perllado medroso.

4. d. otras perssonas algunas q.—6. m. o f.—tomen—7. han—9. entienden—10. m. al r.

4. Latin: *Sic est de episcopis quibusdam et ceteris prelatis:*

8. *Os.* 13:1. Nicole Bozon, who does not make use of this fable, appends this quotation to his fable of the snail, an additional proof that Odo was his source for that fable. Cf. Nicole Bozon, *Les contes moralisés* (ed. Smith and Meyer, Paris, 1889), p. 280.

L

Enxienplo dela Gulpeja

La gulpeja quando ha gran fanbre façese commo muerta en tierra e saca la lengua ansi que uiene el cueruo e el millano cuydando de fallar de comer llegansse aella por comerlle lla lengua. Ella estonçe abre la boca e comelos.

Bien ansi faze el diablo. Façesse muerto, ca nin es oydo nin es uisto e echa su lengua de fuera, que se entiende por algunas cosas deletosas o

por algunas cobdiçias con algunas mugeres fermossas o comeres delicados o buen uino o otras cossas ssemejantes (*fol. 193r*) aestas. E quando el onbre las toma commo non deue, es preso por el diablo ansi commo el cueruo porla rrapossa.

Otrosi toman los rrapossos e los onbres el quesso e ponenlo enla rratonera e toman el mur.

Ansi faze el diablo estrechar muchas mugeres porque se paguen los onbres delas. E pone allos onbres en coraçon que se paguen de algunos castillos o uilas o algo delo ageno. E despues que han conplido ssu voluntad, toma el diablo aellos ansi commo la rratera toma el mur quando el onbre [y pone] el quesso.

8. semejantes repeated.

Chauvin, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 76; Vol. IV, p. 76; Vol. VIII, p. 64.
Juan Manuel, *El Conde Lucanor* (ed. Knust), pp. 135 ff., 361 ff.
Juan Ruiz, *El libro de buen amor* (ed. Ducamin), coplas 1412–24.

11. The allusion to the *rrapossos* is evidently dragged in here to connect what follows with what precedes. We have here to do with two distinct fables in the original and there is no allusion to foxes in the second.

LI

(*Begins about the middle of fol. 173v*)

ENXIENPLO DELA GULPEJA CONLAS GALINAS

Vna gulpeja auia mui grand fanbre e vino al galinero do stauan las galinas e rrogo allas galinas que lo abriesen la puerta. Elas rrespondieron que: Non queremos abrir, ca nuestra enemiga eres e sienpre nos feçiste mal. Ella les dixo: Por todos los santos que son en paraysso vos juro de non vos façer mal. E dixeron las galinas: Non [te] creemos. E dixo la gulpeja: Bien me podedes creer, ca tanto esto aquexada de fanbre e de frio que si alla non me acojedes, àvre a morir de frio. E si moriere, dios demandarlo ha avos he al galo. E las galinas ouieron piedad della e abrieronle la puerta e la gulpeja entro dentro e descansso vn poco e despues que fue scalentada e perdido el frio, oluido el prometimiento que fiçiera (*fol. 174r*) e tomo vna galina e matola e despues echolas a mal.

E la gulpeja se entiende por algunos onbres que son pobres e engañossos e llenos de baratos que por tal que comian bien, mandan que les abran las puertas de algun monesterio rrico, por tal que puedan veuir conlos sinples monjes. E si los non acojen, diçen que non han de morir al

5. N. queremos—13. engañossas

Herlet, *op. cit.*, p. 29.

5. Latin: *Non credimus tibi.*
14. For the epenthesis of *i* in the ending of the present subjunctive, cf. Pidal, *El dialecto leonés*, p. 52.

mundo e diçen que si alli mueren que dios demandara la su anima allos monjes. E ellos auiendo piedad del[los], dexanlo[s] entrar [e] acojenlos. E fuelgan vn poco en tienpo dela pena, porque non sean conosçidos e despues que son professos, tornaran e negaran todos los monjes. E demandaran comeres delicados e onrrados paños mas que la orden manda, auiendo enbidia del abbad e deçiendo mal delos otros, acussando[los] de pecados en guisa que ansi los rrebuelue[n] commo la gulpeja alas galinas.

18. The s of aconjenlos has been blotted in an evident attempt to erase.

19. Latin: *in tempore probationis quiescit*, etc. Should we change *pena* to *prueba?*

LII

Enxienplo delo que acaesçio ala Gulpeja conlas Ouejas

Era vna gulpeja tan cognosçida del ganado que todas llas ouejas se guardauan dela en manera que las ouejas non salian fuera desu termino nin se partian de enderredor delos canes que las guardauan. La gulpeja desque uio esto, penso entresi deçiendo: Yo se que fare. Vestirmee vna piel de oueja e entrare entrelas ouejas e quando u[v]iere tienpo, podre comer delos corderos e delas ovejas. E fizolo ansi.

Bien ansi es de muchos (*fol. 174v*) que traen vestiduras blancas e paresçe que son ouejas de Ihesu Christo e son falsos profetas, ca biven uestidos commo ouejas e de parte de dentro son lobos e gulpejas engañosas. Aquestos tales son rreligiosos falsos e falsos predicatores o los falsos clerigos que non quieren otra cosa delos onbres rricos sinon tierras o uiñas o possesiones. Onde mas querria vn moro o judio por vezino que non tal rreligioso. E si yo supiese que las vestiduras blancas me fiziesen santo, tantas me uistiria vna sobre otra fasta que non pudiese mas traer.

1. que todas repeated—2. delas—4. e. puso e.—10. f. pecadores o.

Herlet, *op. cit.*, p. 30.

---

4. Latin: *cogitauit Vulpes.*
5. Latin: *cum tempus habuero.*
8. Cf. Matt. 7:15.
10. Latin: *falsi monachi, falsi predicatores, falsi religiosi.*
12. The word *moro* is a local touch due to the translator. Latin: *uicinum paganum.*

LIII

Enxienplo del Conde conllos Mercaderes

Era vn conde que auia de costunbre que rrouava a quantos pasauan por vn camino. Los onbres que entendian esto fazian ansi que quando lo veyan, foyan muy fuerte mente e, si podian, armauanse e defendianse muy fuerte mente. El conde quando esto uio, tornose muy bien, el e todos los suyos, e vestieronseençima cogullas de monjes de Çistel e fue-

4. muy repeated.

5. The Cistercians were founded 1098 A. D.

ronse en pos vna conpaña de mercaderes. E llos mercaderes, quando los vieron vestidos de abitos blancos de monjes, dixeron: Aqui vienen monjes e onbres buenos e bien podremos yr seguros conellos. E los mercaderes yuanse su passo. El conde e los suyos alcançaron los mercaderes e desque fueron llegados aellos, desnudaron las cogullas e dieron enellos en manera que llos mataron e lles tomaron quanto trayan.

Aquesto (*fol. 175r*) mismo façen algunos monjes e rreligiosos que vienen allos rricos e se façen ante ellos mui santos e, si pueden, lieuan dellos quanto han.

12. Aquesto twice repeated.

LIV

ENXIENPLO DE VNA OUEJA BLANCA E DE VN ASNO E VN CABRON

Vna oveja blanca e otra negra e vn asno e vn cabron fablauan en rreligion. E dixo la oueja blanca: Catad que pellejo trayo yo. Aquesto sinifica linpieza e honestidad que he de parte de dentro e poresto ualgo mas que ninguno devos. Dixo la oueja negra: Yo so de fuera negra menospreçiada mas de dentro so fermosa. E aca enel mundo soy negra e poresto menospreçio el mundo e lo tengo por suzio. E dixo el asno: Yo so mas santo que ninguno, que trayo cruz enlos onbros e so semejante al cruçifixo e do may[o]res bozes que ninguno. E dixo el cabron: Yo soy mas santo que ninguno, ca soy vestido de çiliçio que se façe delos cabellos delas cabras, e desi muy grand barua que nunca mella rrape, por tal que non parezca fermosso al mundo.

Por estas quatro maneras de bestias se entienden todas las maneras delas ordenes. Por las ouejas blancas se entienden todos quantos son vestidos ansi commo los de Çistel o canonigos rreglares dela orden de Premonstre, porla oueja prieta se entienden todos aquellos que uisten abitos prietos ansi commo monjes prietos. E porel asno que trae cruz enllas espaldas se entiende[n] todos aquellos que traen abitos con cruz ansi commo (*fol. 175v*) los del espital e commo los templeros e commo los de

8. e de m.

7. The cross on the shoulders of the ass was popularly considered a reward bestowed on that animal for having carried Christ, on the occasion of the triumphal entry into Jerusalem. Cf. Rolland, *Faune populaire de la France*, Vol. IV, p. 250.

8. Latin: *alcius aliis clamo.*

13. Orders which wore the white garb at this time were the Carmelites, founded, 1209 A. D. and the Augustinians, founded 1214 A. D.

15. The Regular Canons of Prémontré or the Premonstratenses were founded 1120 A. D. The name in the *Gatos* reads *prmostre*, which I take to be an abbreviation of the French rather than the Latin form. In the available Latin MSS I find the Latin form. Does this indicate that the Spanish translator's original came from France?

16. The most important Black Monks were the Benedictines, founded 529 A. D., and the Dominicans, founded 1215 A. D.

18. The Knights Hospitallers were founded 1198 A. D.

The Templars were founded 1118 A. D. The Knights of Saint John are not mentioned in the Corpus Christi MS. Their founding dates from 1104 A. D.

San Juan (*We revert to fol. 193r*). Por el cabron que trae gran barba se entienden lo[s] de Monte Grande o los llegos de Çistel que traen grandes barbas e non consienten que gelas rayan. Estos alas de uegadas contien[d]en qual destas ordenes es mejor, mas las ovejas blancas e las prietas guarden que si non ay otras santidades enellos sinon las vestiduras seran dela cuenta delas ouejas blancas e prietas deque fabla enel psalmo que dize: Ansi commo ouejas son puestas enel infierno; la muerte las pasçera. Otrosi los tenpleros [e los] del ospital [e] los de San Juan, si otra cruz non han en coraçon, que se entiende por castigar la carne, e si se non guardan de pecado dela carne commo de soberuia o de otros pecados, tales commo estos son asnos del infierno. Otrosi los que traen grandes barbas, quales quier barba[s] (*fol. 193v*) que ellos ayan, nunca entraran en parayso si non façen obras que plegue[n] a dios o non façen buena vida entre los onbres. E ssi por auer gran barba el onbre fuese santo, non avrie en todo el mundo tan santo onbre commo el cabron.

19. el repeated—20. Monte Fai o a l.—21. g. trayan E.—23. v. non s.—25. muerto la asperçera.

20. The Grandimontenses were founded 1074 A. D. I give all these dates on account of the interest they possess in helping to determine the date of Odo's fables. This question is discussed at length by Hervieux, *op. cit.*, Vol. IV, pp. 44 ff.

23. Latin: *sunt de numero illorum* (*sic*) *ouium*, etc.

25. Ps. 48:15: *Sicut oves in infierno positi sunt; mors depascet eos.*

33. *avrie.* The sole instance of the ending *-ie* in the manuscript.

LV

Enxienplo del Galapago conel Bufo

Vn galapago pasaua vna vegada sobre el bufo. E vino otro e firiole [enla cabeça e otro en el coraçon e otro] enel esspinazo. Esstonçe dixo el bufo: Confonda dios tantos señores.

Title: The word *galapago* is a mistranslation of the Latin *traha* (harrow). Cf. Du Cange, *Gloss.*, *s. v.* This misunderstanding on the part of the translator makes nonsense of the whole fable. Latin: *Traha semel transiuit super Bufonem, et unus dens percussit eam in capite, alius in corde, alius in renibus. Et ait Bufo: Deus confundat tot domines! (Variant dentes).*

3. The proverb in this line is very widespread and attests the immense popularity of this fable during the Middle Ages. Odo's source is, in my opinion, again the *Proverbia Magistri Serlonis* (ed. Meyer, *Revue des missions scientifiques*), 1868, p. 175. Master Serlo gives three variants of it: *Dehez eient tanz meistres dist le crapod a l'herse! Sic Buffo trahe dixit: Domini tot sint maledicti! Sic buffo crati fatur: Ve cui tot dominati!* Cf. *Proverbia Heinrici* (ed. Müllenhoff and Scherer, *Denkmäler*), Vol. I, p. 60, where it reads: *Dixit bufo crati: maledicti tot dominati.* The last word is incomprehensible to the editor who comments, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 140: *Es ist dominati zu schreiben was des reimes wegen statt dominantes steht.* Voigt, *Zschr. f. deutsch. Alt.*, Vol. XXII, p. 388, objects to the form *crati: Crati ist sicher eben so verderbt wie dominati; die richt ge fassung bieten die Münchner hss. nr. 14749 und 8356: Bufo trahe dixit maledictio tot dominis sit. Vgl. meine Kl. lat. denkm S. 48.* Both these authorities are probably wrong. *Cratis*, ordinarily meaning *grating*, could easily have meant *harrow.* The synonymous use of *cratis* and *traha* by Master Serlo seems almost conclusive evidence. As for the form *dominati*, Du Cange defines *dominatus* as *seigneurie.* Voigt's emendation would destroy the leonine rhyme. For additional variants of this proverb, cf. Reinsberg. Düringsfeld, *Sprichwörter d. ger. u. rom. Sprachen*, Vol. II, §555; Le Roux de Lincy, *Prov. Franc.*, Vol. I, p. 174; Rolland, *Faune populaire de la France*, Vol. III, p. 54.

Ansi puede deçir el capellan que es puesto por cura delas animas. Demandale el obispo procuraçion; el oficial sus derechos; los escuderos dinero; los troteros demandanle çapatos; los rrapazes camissas; los merinos o alcaldes demandanle seruiçio o los labradores dueños. Estonçe puede deçir a qualquier que lo demanda: Confonda dios tantos señores.

7. demandenle — l. e dueñas.

Herlet, *op. cit.*, p. 34.

5. *Procuraçion* was the enforced hospitality demanded by high church officials of their subject churches and monasteries. Cf. Du Cange, *Gloss.. s. v. Derechos* does not appear to be an exact translation. Latin variants: *fauellos, struellos, aestivales.* The later is the same as the Old French *estivales, estuvales*, meaning "boots." Cf. Du Cange, *Gloss.*, *s. v.* and Godefroy, *Dict.*, *s. v.*

7. The thought seems to be that the officials demand service and the laborers employers.

LVI

ENXIENPLO DELOS MURES CONEL GATO

Los mures vna vegada llegaronse a consejo e acordaron commo sse podria[n] guardar del gato. E dixo el vno que era mas cuerdo que los otros: Atemos vna esquila al pescueço del gato e podernos hemos muy bien guardar del gato, que quando el passare de vn cabo a otro, sienpre veremos la esquilla. E aqueste consejo plugo a todos. Mas dixo vno: Verdad es mas quien atara la esquilla al pescueço del gato? (*fol. 194r*) E rrespondio el vno: Yo non. Rrespondio el otro: Yo non, que por todo el mundo yo non querria llegar ael.

Ansi acaesçe muchas vegadas que los clerigos o monjes se lleuantan contra sus perllados o otros contra sus obispos diziendo: Pluguiese a dios que ouiese tiradolo e que ouiessemos otro obispo o otro abbad! Esto plaçeria a todos mas al cabo dize[n]: Quien le acussasse perdera su dignidad o fallarsea mal dende. E dize el vno: Yo non. Dize el otro: Yo non. Ansi que los menores dexan beuir alos mayores mas por miedo que non por amor.

6. gato repeated — r. quien atara la esquila al pescueço del gato? E rrespondio e.—11. abbas—13. dizen—Dizet—14. d. teuir a, the t of last word crossed out.

Herlet, *op. cit.*, p. 34, considers this story original with Odo. But cf. Chauvin, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 109.

5. Latin: *audire. Veremos* must here mean "perceive."

LVII

ENXIENPLO DEL MUR QUE CAYO ENLA CUBA

El mur vna vegada cayo en vna cuba de vino. El gato pasaua por y e oyo el mur do façia grand rroydo enel vino e non podia salir. E dixo el gato: Por que gritas tanto? Rrespondio el mur: Porque non puedo salir. E dixo el gato: Que me daras si te saco? Dixo el mur: Darte he quanto tu me demandares. E dixo el gato: Ssi te yo saco, quiero que

des esto, que vengas ami quantas vegadas te llamare. E dixo el mur: Esto uos prometo que fare. E dixo el gato: Quiero que melo jures. El mur prometiogelo. El gato saco el mur del vino e dexolo yr (*fol. 194v*) para su forado e un dia el gato auia grand fanbre e fue al forado del mur e dixole que viniese. E dixo el mur: Non lo fare si dios quisiere. E dixo el gato: Non lo juraste tu ami que saldrias quando te llamasse? E respondio el mur: Ermano, beodo era quando lo dixe.

Ansi conteçe a muchos eneste mundo. Quando son dolientes e son en prission e an algun rreçelo de muerte, estonçes ordenan sus façiendas e ponen sus coraçones de emendar los tuertos que tienen a dios fechos e prometen de ayunar e dar limosnas e de guardase de pecados en otras cosas ssemejantes aestas. Mas quando dios los libra de peligros enque estan, non han cuydado de conplir el uoto que prometen a dios, antes dizen: En pelligro era e non estaua bien enmi sesso; o: Tan bien me sacara dios de aquel peligro aunque non prometiera nada.

Ansi cuenta de vna pulga que tomo un abbad ensu pescueço. Començo deçir: Agora te tengo. Muchas vegadas me mordiste e me despertaste mas nunca esscaparas demy manu, antes te quiero luego matar. E dixo la pulga: Padre ssanto, pues tu voluntad es de me matar, ponme entu palma porque pueda mejor confessar mis pecados e desque fuere confessada, podermeas matar. El abbad mouiolle piedad. (*fol. 195r*) Puso la pulga enla mano e la pulga, desque sse uio enla palma, dio un grand salto e fuese. E el abbad començola de llamar mas nunca la pulga se quisso tornar.

Ansi es de muchos eneste mundo que quando son escapados non pagan nada.

LVIII

Enxienplo del Onbre que sele quemo la Casa

Cuenta mas aqui que vn onbre quemosele lla casa que tenia llena de trigo. E quando su señor la vio quemar ovo muy gran pessar [d]ella e començo muy fuerte a suspirar e a llorar. E llorando dezia: Señor dios, amata este fuego. Yo te prometo que de este trigo, portu amor, allos pobres. En aquella ora fue muerto el fuego [e] el trigo librado que non fiço mal ninguno. Mas desque su dueño touo el trigo ensu poder, non lo partio allos pobres ansi commo lo auia prometido, ca los onbres enel tienpo del peligro creen e despues descreen.

E aquel o[nbre que] ansi façe al cabo despues non gana nada; o lle da dios otra tribullaçion mayor o llo lleua al infierno. Ca dios [da] las tribulaçiones e [si] tiene que aquello que dios le da que gelo da porsus pecados e llo sufre en paciençia lo mejor que puede, tornargelo ha en paz e gozo.

6. Oias d. s.—10. o llos l.—11. p. tribullaçiones e l. sufra.

7. Latin: *Quoniam ad tempus credunt et [in] tempore temptationis recedunt.*

9. What follows does not occur in the Corpus Christi MS.

LIX

ENXIENPLO DEL LOBO CONLLA LIEBRE

El lobo e lla liebre encontraronse en vn camino e dixo el lobo alla liebre: Sobre to[das las] animalias que enel mundo son eres tu la mas lijera. El dixo alla liebre: Ossarias tu pelear con otra animalia alguna? E dixo la liebre: (*fol. 195v*) Digote que si, aun contigo, maguer que as grand cuerpo o yo pequeño. El lobo assañosse mucho e dixo: Apostarte[e] yo ati diez maravedis por vno que vençere. Plaçeme mucho, dixo la liebre, sola mente que yo sea segura de aquesta postura. E dieron amos fiadores el vno al otro. E despues que los fiadores fueron dados, el lobo e la liebre entraron enel canpo por pellear. El lobo [corria] contra la liebre por la matar. E lla liebre començo a foyr, el lobo tres ella por la alcançar. Mas la liebre corria mas ligera mente. El lobo staua ya cansado e echosse enel suelo commo aquel que non podia mas correr. E dixo la liebre: Hermano, vençido eres e cayo en tierra. E dixo el lobo: E tu, por que non me quisiste esperar? E dixo la liebre: Verdad es, que que batalla podria ser entre nos amos, siendo tu trestanto mayor que non yo. E tu teniendo la boca abierta, tan bien cabria yo dentro. Ca yo nunca me conbato ssi non fuyendo conlos pies. Ca fuyendo anssi muchas vezes he uençido allos canes e allos caçadores que yuan en pos demi. Pues tu eres vençido, dame lo que deues. Aquesta demanda fue ante el leon e el leon dio por su sentençia que la liebre auia de auer los dineros pues que el lobo era vençido.

Bien ansi quien se quiere conbatir conla luxuria e conel

2. t. lamada lijera — 14. quiqiste — 18. v. uenço a.

The Codex ends at this point.

Herlet, *op. cit.*, p. 36.

---

2. Latin: *Super omnia es animal meticulosum.*

3. There has been no omission as would seem to be indicated by the awkward repetition of *dixo*.

6. *diez maravedis* translates *X aureos.*

9. Latin: *Lupus currebat uersus Leporem*, etc.

10. *tres* = *tras*. The weakening of *a* to *e* already commented upon.

13. *cayo* = *caydo*. Another example of the fall of intervocalic *d*. Latin: *Iam uictus es et ad terram prostratus.*

18. *he uençido*. Latin: *uici*, etc.

G. T. NORTHUP

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

ITALIAN AND ELIZABETHAN COMEDY

Dr. Cunliffe in a recent article[1] has called attention to some connections, proved and hypothetical, between Italian and English drama in the sixteenth century; in general he agrees with Dr. Ward[2] that the English stage received a direct impulse, not only from Seneca, Plautus and Terence, but from Italian tragedy and comedy. In this paper I wish to give a few facts that go to prove this connection as more fundamental and far-reaching than has heretofore been supposed.

It may, I believe, be shown that many an English play which has been traced to a *novella* source, goes back more directly to an Italian play founded on the *novella*. The great mass of Italian dramas in the sixteenth century was romantic, so romantic, indeed, as to justify Camerini in calling Boccaccio the fountain-head of Italian comedy.[3] The *Commedia dell' arte* especially used much material from the *novelle* and from folk legends, developing this subject-matter through the popular masks of Pantalone, Signor Capitano, pedant, young lovers, comic servants, witch, and magician.[4] Men of letters like Ariosto kept more closely to classic form than did the humbler playwrights, who, like Andrea Calmo, were often traveling actors. Yet these lesser men learned valuable lessons from the classicists, and by the end of the century many of them, using much *novella* material, wrote up from *scenari* regular intrigue comedies of the Latin type.[5]

The hypothesis that these productions were known in England, is borne out by three kinds of evidence. In the first place we have documentary proof that traveling Italian players visited London; secondly, many English comedies contain internal evidence of Italian origin, or at least of strong Italian influence; and, most

[1] "The Influence of Italian on Early English Drama," *Modern Philology*, April, 1907.

[2] *History of English Dramatic Literature* (London, 1899), Vol. I, p. 168.

[3] Camerini, *Nuovi profili letterati* (Milano, 1886), Vol. III, chap. i, especially pp. 1-3.

[4] Rossi, Introduction to *Lettere di Andrea Calmo* (Torino, 1880), p. lix.

[5] A. Bartoli, *Scenari inediti della commedia dell' arte* (Firenze, 1880), pp. lviii ff. A collection of such plays was published at Florence in 1750, *Il teatro comico*.

satisfactory of all, certain English plays have been traced directly to Italian originals. In this investigation I have confined myself almost exclusively to comedy, but I am sure that similar connections could be established for tragedy and the pastoral. Mr. Greg in his treatise, *Pastoral Poetry and Pastoral Drama* (London, 1906), has made important discoveries in this field.

Unless something is known of Italian actors in the sixteenth century, the influence of their plays will never be duly appreciated. These troupes from the time they began to form were great travelers. After 1570 company after company of *comici* visited Paris, and to judge from our English records were favorites in London also.[1] In July, 1574, "Italian players followed the progress and made pastime at Reading; among their characters were Shepherds, Nymphs, Saturn [Satyrs?], Devils, and Wild Man."[2] Still earlier, in 1572, the earl of Lincoln gave an entertainment to the queen, in which there was "an Italian play and divars vautars and leapers of divars sorts, vearie excellent."[3] In January, 1579, a masque of amazons and knights was presented before Elizabeth; the speeches were written in English and translated into Italian, evidently for presentation by Italian actors.[4] More important than any of these, because more definite, is a record in the *Acts of the Privy Council* for January, 1577–78: a license was granted to "Drousiano, an Italian commediante" and his troupe, to play in London till the beginning of Lent.[5] Dr. Furness, remarking on this visit, says it discloses "an intimate relationship at that early date between the English and Italian stage, of which too little account is made by those who wish to explain Shakspere's knowledge of Italian manners and names."[6]

It is possible in the light of modern French scholarship to confirm Collier's cautious guess, that this company "might represent extemporal comedies." Drusiano was a brother of Tristano

[1] Moland, *Molière et la comédie italienne* (Paris, 1867), chaps. i–iv; Baschet, *Les comédiens italiens à la cour de France* (Paris, 1882).

[2] Fleay, *Chronicle History of the London Stage* (London, 1890), p. 22, cited from the accounts of *The Master of the Revels.*

[3] Nichols, *Progresses of Queen Elizabeth* (London, 1823), Vol. I, p. 41.

[4] Fleay, *op. cit.*, p. 26.

[5] Cf. Collier, *Annals of the Stage* (London, 1826), Vol. III, p. 398, note.

[6] *Much Ado about Nothing*, Furness Variorum ed., Introd.

Martinelli, the famous Arlecchino of the *Gelosi*, the best-known troupe of *comici* in Paris.[1] Before coming to London at the head of a company of his own, Drusiano had played with the *Gelosi*, like his brother, in the rôle of Arlecchino. Later, in 1580, he and his wife, Madonna Angelica, were heading the duke of Mantua's comedians.[2] Through French and Mantuan records, therefore, it is easy to build up a knowledge of Drusiano's probable repertory in England. He doubtless gave there some of the *Commedie dell' arte* which the *Gelosi* had acted the previous year in Paris;[3] and, for variety, he probably acted pastorals and classical plays with elaborate *intermedii*, as well as *commedie erudite* written by members of the "academies" to which so many actors belonged.[4] The *Inganni* comedy, compared by Manningham to *Twelfth Night*,[5] was written by Alessandro Piccolomini, a member of the Siennese academy of Gl' Intronati; as Piccolomini's plays were among the most popular in the repertory of the *Gelosi* and the *Fedeli*, there is no reason why this particular one may not have been given in London by a company of Italian actors.[6]

Very few names of these visiting players have survived or have yet come to light. But Drusiano's company can hardly have been the last. Coryat must be alluding to one in commenting on a play he attended in Venice: "I saw women acte, a thing I never saw before, though I have heard it hath beene sometimes used in London."[7] If "used in London" it must have been by visiting Italians, as these were the only European troupes of the day in which women were allowed to act.

These records and references, though not so positive as we could wish, still give us a series of strong probabilities. Although we know so few names of actors, and no titles of plays except the

[1] Rasi, *I comici italiani* (Firenze, 1897), under "Martinelli."

[2] Ancona, "Teatro Montovano nel secolo XVI," *Giornale storico*, Vol. VI.

[3] Moland, *Molière et la comédie italienne*, chaps. iv, v, gives a full summary of the repertory of the *Gelosi*.

[4] Francesco Andreini, the *Capitano* of the *Gelosi*, was a member of the Florentine *Spensierati;* his wife, the famous Isabella, of the Pavian *Intenti*. Cf. Moland, *op. cit.*, p. 51.

[5] Manningham's *Diary*, February 2, 1601–2. (*Publications of the Camden Society*, Vol. XCIX.)

[6] Riccoboni, *Histoire de l'ancien théâtre italien* (London, 1726), lists Piccolomini's plays. Cf. also Camerini, *Nuovi profili*, Vol. III, pp. 61 ff.

[7] *Coryat's Crudities* (London, 1776, from ed. of 1611), Vol. II, pp. 16, 17.

one mentioned by Manningham, we are perfectly justified in saying that Italian actors were well known in London and that they played there the kind of repertory which they invariably gave elsewhere. Had their visits been fewer than they were, English actors would still have become acquainted with Italian dramatic material and methods through contact on the continent. On September 18, 1604, an English troupe played a tragedy before the dauphin, while the *Gelosi* and the *Fedeli* were in Paris.[1] Thomas Heywood tells us[2] that such royal favor to British actors was not uncommon, for he says: "The French king allows certain companies in Paris and Orleans, besides other cities; so doth the king of Spain in Civill, Madrill, and other provinces." In all these places the English and Italians would come into rivalry, and it is certain that the Englishmen would learn much from their more polished and skilful fellow-artists. Tarlton's "piperly extemporalizing" is not the only relic of an Italian influence on English stagecraft. The use of prose for comedy was probably due not only to the *Supposes* but to cumulative Italian example. Scherillo thinks he discerns in some of Shakspere's high-flown speeches, traces of the *concetti* so common in the *Commedie dell' arte*, and quite unknown in the more everyday style of the *novelle*.[3] This is, however, impossible to prove, and it is dangerous to trace to foreign models such natural dramatic ornaments as set rhetorical speeches. It is more probable, but as yet only a guess, that a connection may be found between the rhymed couplets closing so many English scenes and acts, and the *chiusette* of the Italian plays;[4] the English couplets are often in the half-burlesque style of the *chiusette*, and they occur most frequently in intrigue comedies like Field's, which closely resemble Italian plays.

It is a question whether the English ever learned to improvise in the Italian manner, from a *scenario*. The stage "plats" discovered by Malone among Alleyn's property are in form similar to the *scenari* used for *commedie improvise*, though they give

[1] Rigal, *Le théâtre français avant la période classique* (Paris, 1901), p. 50, note.

[2] *Apology for Actors*, p. 58 (Shakspere Society, 1841).

[3] Scherillo, *La commedia dell' arte*, in *La vita ital. nel '600* (1887), pp. 338, 339.

[4] Examples of *chiusette* are given by Bartoli, *Scenari inediti*, p. lxxix, and Neri, in *Giornale storico* (1883), p. 78.

much more meager directions.[1] One of these "plats," the *Dead Man's Fortune*, is evidently from an Italianate play. It is an intrigue Comedy, containing a Pantaloon and his zany, Peascod, and other personages with romantic Italian names. But the outline of the action is so slight that the play cannot be traced definitely to its source.

The peculiar practice of improvising dialogue from a given plot seems to have impressed the Elizabethan pamphleteers and dramatists more strongly than any other feature of the Italian drama. Whetstone refers to it in his remark that the "Comedians of Ravenna" were "not tied to any written discourse," but had "certain grounds or principles of their own" from which they improvised dialogue.[2] Similar references abound in the English plays of the period. The most often quoted of these is Kyd's reminiscence in the *Spanish Tragedy* (Act IV, scene 1):

> The Italian tragedians were so sharp of wit
> That in one hour's meditation
> They would perform anything in action.

and in continuation (Act IV, scene 4):

> Here comes Lorenzo, look upon the plot
> And tell me, brother, what part plays he?

Again, there is a typical Italian suggestion when Bellimperia is urged to take a part: "What's a play without a woman in it?"

Another description of the *Commedia dell' arte* is found in Middleton and Rowley's *Spanish Gypsy* (Act III, scene 1), when Roderigo asserts:

> The scenical school
> Hath been my tutor long in Italy.

And in Act IV, scene 4, Fernando precisely explains the method of this scenical school:

> There is a way
> Which the Italians and the Frenchmen use,
> That is, on a word given, or some slight plot,
> The actors will extempore fashion out
> Scenes neat and witty.

[1] Collier, *Annals of the Stage*, Vol. III, pp. 398 f., and Halliwell-Phillips, *Theatre Plats of Three Old English Dramas* (London, 1860).

[2] *Heptameron of Civil Discourses* (1582).

Rôles are then apportioned as in the above-quoted lines from the *Spanish Tragedy*, Fernando directing the assignment as he glances over the plot:

> Let this father be a Don of a brave spirit;
> Play him up high, not like a pantaloon.

A comedy is begun so exactly in the Italian style that it sounds like a translation.

Whether Cleopatra's forecast of how "the quick comedians extemporally will stage us,"[1] refers to the Italian practice is doubtful. But there is one more unmistakable allusion to it in Brome's *City Wit* (1632):

> In that lies the nobility of the device; it should be done after the fashion of Italy, by ourselves, only the plot premeditated to what our aim must tend; marry, the speeches must be extempore.

A much-disputed phrase in *Hamlet* can refer only to this same Italian custom. Polonius commends the traveling actors in terms very suitable to the wandering *comici;* they were "the best men in the world for tragedy, comedy, history, pastoral," etc.; for them "Seneca is not too heavy nor Plautus too light;" they were the only men for "the law of writ and the liberty."[2] Such a conglomerate repertory certainly belonged to the English companies of the day, but it was even more characteristic of the Italians, who gave actual Seneca and Plautus, and both written and improvised plays. For surely Collier's common-sense interpretation of "the law of writ and the liberty," as written and improvised plays, is more probable than the explanations of more recent critics, who would have the phrase refer to "regular and romantic plays."[3] The modern distinction would probably not have occurred to Shakspere, whereas the difference in the two methods of acting fell within his own experience.[4]

In view of all the allusions to a typically Italian custom it is quite certain that Elizabethan actors and playwrights were

[1] *Antony and Cleopatra*, Act V, scene 2.

[2] *Hamlet*, Act II, scene 2. Cf. Furness Variorum ed. for several interpretations of this phrase.

[3] Cf. C. H. Herford's ed. of *Hamlet*, Act II, scene 2, for note on this passage.

[4] He inveighs against improvisation, *Hamlet*, Act III, scene 2.

familiar with the *Commedia dell' arte*. Subtler traces of this same familiarity are not hard to find in the subject-matter, the dramatic motifs, the character types and their names, of Elizabethan and Jacobean comedy. At some future time I hope to develop this internal evidence more convincingly than I can do at present. Meanwhile I will only point out a few parallels between English and Italian character types.

Sidney's summary of the butts proper to the comic dramatist[1] is a fairly accurate list of the set types of Italian drama—"the pedant, the braggart, the hedge priest, the fool, and the boy," as Shakspere calls his own version of them in *Love's Labour's Lost* (Act V, scene 2, l. 545). Thomas Heywood gives a similar list of "all the doctors, zawnyes, pantaloones, harlakenes, in which the French, but especially the Italians, have been excellent;" he considers that comedy should have in derision "foolish innamorates" and "Pantaloones that have unthrifty sons."[2] The "self-wise seeming schoolmaster," whose mouth is full of platitudinous nonsense—stupidity pompously disguised in mongrel Latin and bombastic conceits—this pedant *Dottore* is a purely Italian type.[3] He makes his first appearance in English comedy as Rombus in Sidney's *Lady of May*, a significant fact in view of Sidney's known Italianate taste. Professor Fletcher has pointed out to me some striking resemblances between Rombus and the Venetian doctors of Andrea Calmo's plays.[4] Not less important is Shakspere's Holofernes, whose name, manner of speech, and general imbecility place him far nearer to the Italian stage type than to a possible village personage of Shakspere's acquaintance. Holofernes cites the beginning of a Latin eclogue by Mantuan, and adds an Italian couplet in praise of Venice, which reminds Scherillo of similar speeches by Dottore Graziano, the pedant of the *Gelosi*.[5] A kind of scene fairly common in the *Commedia dell' arte*, is imitated in the *Taming of the Shrew* (Act III, scene 1); here

[1] *Defense of Poesie*, ed. A. S. Cook (Boston, 1898), p. 51.

[2] *Apology for Actors*, pp. 43, 54.

[3] Montaigne says: "Je me suis souvent despité en mon enfance de veoir lez comédiens italiens avoir tous jours un pedant pour badin."

[4] *Lettere di A. Calmo*, Introd. by V. Rossi.

[5] *Love's Labour's Lost*, Act IV, scene 2. Cf. Scherillo, *La vita ital. nel '600*, p. 336.

Lucentio, disguised as a pedant, makes love to Bianca under pretense of reading her a Latin lesson.[1]

The Spanish captain, insufferably boastful, and no less easily duped than the pedant doctor, figured very constantly in Italian comedy. He appears in Kyd's *Soliman and Perseda* under the name of Basilisco, whom Mr. Boas calls "a notable variation" in the *Miles Gloriosus* type, for "with the Coxcombry of the braggart he unites much of the inflated verbiage of the pedant."[2] Now it is just such a combination that made Francesco Andreini's Capitano Spavento a famous model for his Italian successors in the rôle. Basilisco, moreover, was the name of the braggart in *Gl' amorosi inganni*, a play published in Paris in 1609 from an old *scenario*.[3] Perhaps this play may have been given in London by a traveling company, and Kyd may have seen and imitated its Signor Capitano. However this may be, it seems certain that Basilisco owed more than his name to the Italian stage tradition; he represents the newer variation of the classic boasting soldier, and is the forerunner of Shakspere's Armado and Parolles. The last-named hero is a particularly good example of the Italian type, not only in his language, but in his relations with the other characters of the play. The scene in which Parolles falls into the hands of jesting soldiers and is frightened by their gibberish into betraying army secrets, must come, Scherillo thinks, "addirittura desunta da uno scenario."[4] If not from a *scenario*, it is at least very similar to the *lazzi* scenes so common in Italian drama, in which the Captain is the butt of the disguised *zanni*.[5]

For the comic servant, the *zanni*, was always intriguing to humiliate his master's enemies and rivals. He did this by elaborate ruses and disguises similar to those of Brain-Worm in Jonson's *Every Man in His Humour*. The Elizabethan dramatists use the term *zany* often enough to show that they were perfectly familiar with the character, more familiar indeed, than are modern critics.

[1] Scherillo, *op cit.*, p. 337.

[2] *Works of T. Kyd*, ed. F. K. Boas, Introd. to "Soliman and Perseda."

[3] Rasi, *I comici italiani*, I, p. 75. *Gl' amorosi inganni* is a rare play, inaccessible in this country.

[4] Scherillo, *op. cit.*, p. 335. Cf. *All's Well That Ends Well*, Act IV, scene 1.

[5] *Zanni* is the bergomask abbreviation for *Giovanni*, and is a common peasant name.

There have been many misinterpretations of such passages as Malvolio's: "I take these wise men that crow so at these set kind of fools, no better than the fool's zanies." In a note on "Zanies" Dr. Furness sums up the explanations of previous critics;[1] among all these the only one that is correct is that of a contemporary and an Italian, John Florio. In his *Worlde of Wordes* (1598) he defines: "*Zane:* Name of John. Also a sillie John, a gull or noddie. Used also for a simple vice, clowne, foole, or simple fellow in a playe or comedie." Halliwell on the basis of this, but not uninfluenced by the modern idea of a clown, says: "the term 'zany' was generally applied in England to an inferior fool or buffoon, attending on and imitating another." It is simpler to take "zanies," in Malvolio's phrase, to mean what it does in Italian comedy—foolish servants. The *zanni* was an attendant of a principal character in a play; when there were rival lovers each had his *zanni*, the knavish servant following the "lover beloved," and the foolish servant belonging to the unsuccessful suitor.[2]

In the early stages of development of the *Commedia dell' arte*, the *zanni* followed a traveling mountebank, and amused the audience by singing and dancing in the intervals between his master's advertisements of false wares.[3] Ben Jonson knew this custom, at first hand or by hearsay, for he describes a scene of this early kind of *Commedia dell' arte*. In *Volpone* (Act II, scene 1) the villain-hero masquerades as Scoto, a Mantuan mountebank, beneath Celia's window; Nano, as Zan Fritada, sings between his master's *ragionamenti*, until Celia's husband rushes out crying that he will be called the *Pantalone dei Bisognosi*. "Signor Flaminio," he says, "will you down, sir, down? Is my wife your Franciscina, sir?" And in true *Commedia dell' arte* manner he beats away the disguised intruders. The whole scene is very significant, for it is an exact imitation of a common *Commedia dell' arte* device. Flaminio and Franciscina were the stock names of lovers, or of lover and *servetta* in the plays of the *Gelosi*.[4] The

[1] *Twelfth Night*, Furness Variorum ed., Act I, scene 5.

[2] Rasi, *I comici italiani*, Vol. I, p. 461.

[3] Riccoboni, *op. cit.*, chap. iii, gives much information about the *zanni* whose function was "con goffissima lingua .... fare l' arte del far ridere."

[4] Moland, *op. cit.*, pp. 57, 68.

Pantalone dei Bisognosi made his first appearance as the *Magnifico* in a *scenario* of 1568; but the term later became conventional for the duped husband or deceived father.[1] The *lazzo* which closes the scene is the commonest of all Italian devices for rousing laughter. A *bastone da bastonare* was an invariable property for an Italian comedy.[2] Another sign that Jonson was familiar with the Italians is given by Sir Politick's praise of the Mountebanks as "the only languaged men in the world." This is not surprising when we read that A. Beolco, "Il Ruzzante," a Venetian playwright-actor, wrote several plays, each containing from five to seven different languages and dialects.[3]

Returning from this digression to the *zanni*, we can see how his early association with a mountebank gave rise to the idea that he was only an "inferior buffoon." Halliwell, among others, remarks that "the fool or attendant of a mountebank is called a zany," and he quotes from Jonson, "He's like a zany to a tumbler, that tries tricks after him to make men laugh;"[4] and from *Cynthia's Revels* (Act II, scene 1), "The other gallant is his zany and doth most of these tricks after him." Here Jonson is evidently thinking of the earlier kind of *zanni*, who had not yet developed into the comic servant of "stage plays." It seems that this development of the *zanni* rôle should be somewhat regarded in definitions of his function, and that such definitions should include his later dignity as intriguer and plot-mover, as well as his first estate of attendant buffoon to a mountebank.[5]

It is interesting to speculate as to the identity of "the French Harlakene," mentioned by Marston in *The Malcontent* (1604). This is too late a date to refer to Drusiano, who probably played his usual rôle of Arlecchino in England 1577–78. Day had evidently seen some *zanni* in the part, for a page in the *Ile of Gulls* (Act II, scene 3) says: "I, like Harlakene in an Italian comedy,

[1] Ancona, *Giornale storico*, Vol. VI, pp. 23, 24.

[2] Moland, *op. cit.*, p. 64.

[3] Rasi, *op. cit.*, p. 350 ff. Each character type spoke a different dialect; the captain, a mongrel Spanish; the pedant, poor Latin; the lovers, Tuscan; the Magnifico, Venetian, etc.

[4] *Every Man in His Humour*, Act IV, scene 1.

[5] *Lazzi* were tricks, comic "business" used to fill the gaps in the action of the play. Cf. Moland, *op. cit.*, pp. 27, 28; Riccoboni, *op. cit.*, p. 65.

stand making faces at both their follies." Arlecchino was always an athlete and tumbler, and drew on these resources for his *lazzi* scenes.[1] Bottom's dance, the *Bergomask*,[2] must have been a peculiarity of the *zanni's* rôle, for Arlecchino was traditionally a peasant of Bergamo. But besides dances and athletic feats, he was expected to furnish merriment by his affected stupidity and by his impudence. A typical *lazzi* scene is that in which Grumio pretends not to understand Petruchio's command to knock:[3] "Whom shall I knock, sir? Is there any man has rebused your worship?" His real impudence veiled under apparent sincerity, his master's threats and the blows which close the scene, together with the conventional couplet of greeting, in Italian, between Petruchio and Hortensio, all these features suggest imitation of a *Commedia dell' arte*. A somewhat similar scene is quoted by Croce from a *scenario*;[4] here Volpino (the master) thunders at a door behind which he knows Pulcinella to be; the servant from within answers: "Not at home," and there follows a dialogue similar in style to that between Grumio and Petruchio, and, like that, ended by blows.

If the pedant, the captain, and the comic servant contributed their peculiarities to the English stage types, the Pantaloon was quite as important. Grumio, in the *Taming of the Shrew*, is a direct transcript of the Italian pantaloon doctor of the *Suppositi*, and may be allowed to stand for an example of the type. He is old, stupid, avaricious, amorous, and jealous, and, together with the captain and pedant, is always the dupe of the young lovers and their allies, *Zanni* and *Servetta*. The type is a distinct variation of the classic *senex* and is fairly constant in Italian comedy, both written and improvised. *Pantalone* is the Venetian *Magnifico*. Accordingly, when Iago calls Brabantio the "old Magnifico," we expect him to be as jealous as the "old Pantaloon" in the *Taming of the Shrew*. Later, in the seventeenth century, the term is used to mean "fool" and Pantaloons are often introduced into antemasques as clowns, for instance in Jonson's *Vision of Delight*.[5]

[1] See n. 5 on p. 564.

[2] *Midsummer Night's Dream*, Act V, scene 1. Cf. Schmidt, *Shakspere Lexicon*, under "Bergomask."

[3] *Taming of the Shrew*, Act I, scene 2. [4] Croce, *Pulcinella* (Rome, 1899), p. 39.

[5] Nichols, *Progresses of James I*, Vol. II, p. 65; Vol. III, p. 457.

All these indications of an Italian influence on the characters and material of Elizabethan comedy would be comparatively valueless if no Elizabethan play had been traced to an Italian original. Seven English comedies, however, have been proved to be more or less faithful adaptations or translations of Italian dramas. Ariosto's *Suppositi* is not only the original of Gascoigne's *Supposes*, but also enters largely into Shakspere's *Taming of the Shrew*. In the same year that the *Supposes* appeared (1566), another Italian play, Grazzini's *La spiritata*, was adapted in an English version, the anonymous *Bugbears*.[1] In 1584 Munday, "our best plotter," translated out of the Italian *Fidele and Fortunio, the Deceipts in Love of Two Italian Gentlemen*, a play which is the probable source of Shakspere's *Two Gentlemen of Verona*. Shakspere also adapted, with great change of tone, Piccolomini's *Gl' ingannati*, in *Twelfth Night*.[2] Piccolomini was the author also of *Alessandro*, quite faithfully translated by Chapman in his *May Day*.[3] Tomkis took *Albumazar* (1614) from Z. B. della Porta's *L' astrologo*.[4] Besides these complete plays taken from the Italian, König thinks he has found traces of Grazzini's *La Strega* in *Hamlet* and of Verlato's *Rodopeia* in the *Merchant of Venice*. But his quotations of parallel passages are far from convincing; like parallels between Shakspere and Sophocles, they should be attributed to coincidence or to common proverbial sayings.[5]

The vexed question of an Italian influence on Lyly has never been satisfactorily settled. Undoubtedly Schücking is right in seeing a *Commedia dell' arte* motif in *Endimion*, Act I, scene 2, and in the other scenes in which Thopas is baited by the pages and their sweethearts.[6] But Bond's objection is justified; Schücking does not prove his points.[7]

[1] *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen*, Vols. XCVIII (1897), XCIX, C.

[2] *Twelfth Night*, Furness Variorum ed., appendix; *Gl' ingannati* was translated into French by F. Juste in 1543, as *Les abusés*, and may have come to Shakspere's knowledge in this way. However, Italian *comici* frequently played the original.

[3] Stiefel, "G. Chapman u. das italienische Drama," *Shakspere Jahrbuch*, Vol. XXXV (1899).

[4] König, "Über die Entlehnungen Shaksperes, insbesonders aus Rabelais u. einigen italienischen Dramatikern," *Shakspere Jahrbuch*, Vol. IX (1874), pp. 207–9.

[5] *Shakspere Jahrbuch*, Vol. IX, pp. 227 ff.

[6] Schücking, *Studien über die stofflichen Beziehungen der eng. Komödie zur italienischen bis Lilly* (Halle, 1901), pp. 102 f.

[7] *Works of J. Lyly*, ed. by R. W. Bond, Vol. III, note on the Italian influence on Lyly.

Until we read more Italian sixteenth-century comedies and until more is definitely known of the relations between the actors of the two countries, we cannot appreciate the full indebtedness of Elizabethan to Italian playwrights. It ought not to be impossible to trace, from official documents, other names beside Drusiano's to their proper places in the records of traveling *comici*, and to build up a knowledge of repertories given in England by these men and women. The fact that many Italian plays must have been given in London, does away with any improbability in the connection of the two stages between certain dates. Internal evidence, then, in the Elizabethan plays themselves may be given its full value, and may lead, as it has already done in Chapman's *May Day*, to tracing many a comedy to its proper source in the Italian drama, rather than in the *novelle*. Soon I hope to present more detailed evidence toward proof of this hypothesis.

WINIFRED SMITH

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

ABLAUT-RELATIONS IN THE WEAK VERB IN GOTHIC, OLD HIGH GERMAN, AND MIDDLE HIGH GERMAN

The Indo-European *ablaut* is well preserved in the Germanic languages, especially in the verb. In the strong verb it forms the basis of the whole tense system. Nouns, verbs, adjectives, and other parts of speech are interrelated in this *ablaut* system, and it is impossible to tell which is the oldest in any case. For a certain base may have originated as a noun and then given a verb or other part of speech, or, vice versa, the noun may be the later form coming from some form of the verb-stem.

The Germanic languages have inherited, as it were, their strong verbs from the oldest Germanic times. The formative period had long passed when literary documents began to appear, so that additions in historic times were few. On the other hand, in later times, especially in the Middle High German and early New High German periods, many strong forms were either lost or became weak. The number of strong verbs is therefore quite limited, while the number of weak verbs is countless, for new formations are usually weak and are for the most part later noun or verb derivatives—that is, they are causatives or denominatives and the like.

From this it would appear that on the whole the Germanic strong verbs present an older and more primitive appearance than the related weak verbs (cf. on this subject Wilmanns, II, pp. 27 ff., and Grimm, *D. G.*, II, 7 ff.). The *ablaut*-series having become firmly established in the strong verb, it was easy to form related weak verbs in these same series.

This study which will appear in two parts will present the weak verbs in Gothic, Old High German, and Middle High German that are related either to strong verbs or are interrelated according to the regular *ablaut*-series without the presence of a strong verb.

Part I contains the weak verbs in these dialects arranged under the corresponding strong verbs according to the *ablaut*-series. A verb will be considered strong if it has strong forms as late as the Middle High German period; otherwise weak, although it may have analogical strong forms later than that.

Part II will contain a similar classification of the interrelated weak verbs that have no related strong verbs but that arose probably through '*ablaut*-feeling' by analogy.

Many new words, mostly onomatopoetic, with the *ablaut i: a: u* arose, beginning about the Middle High German period (cf. Wilmanns, II, 22, and Paul, *Principien der Sprachgeschichte*, 2d ed., p. 144 ff.). This was due doubtless to the prominence of the regular *ablaut inx: anx: unx*, which came to be felt as an *i: a: u-ablaut* regardless of the following consonants, so that forms like MHG. *girren: garren: gurren*, NHG. *piff: paff: puff* sprang up alongside of regular forms like NHG. *tingel: tangel.* In English and New High German these new *ablaut*-forms increased greatly in number, but in these studies the Middle High German or earlier forms only (cf. OHG. *kichazzen: kachazzen* 'lachen') will be considered. They will be treated by themselves at the end of Part II.

Completeness as far as the nature of the task will permit was aimed at only with regard to the Gothic, Old High German, and Middle High German weak verbs that show *ablaut*-relation with any other words in these same dialects, although numerous examples of other parts of speech in these and other Germanic languages were introduced to add to the *ablaut*-scheme. Words distantly related are always referred to at the end of a group thus —cf. OHG., MHG., etc.

The special collections of glosses could doubtless furnish forms not found in the dictionaries, but such forms will be missing here.

The following works have been used principally, and reference is made to them occasionally.

GRIMM, JAC. *Deutsche Grammatik*, Zweite Ausgabe, 4 Bde. Berlin u. Gütersloh, 1870–98.

HEYNE, M. *Ulfilas oder die erhaltenen Denkmäler der gotischen Sprache.* Neunte Aufl. Paderborn, 1896.

Jacobi, Theo. *Beiträge zur deutschen Grammatik.* Berlin, 1843.
Kluge, F. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache.* Fünfte verbesserte Aufl. Strassburg, 1894.
Lexer, M. *Mittelhochdeutsches Handwörterbuch.* 3 Bde. Leipzig, 1872–78.
Schade, O. *Altdeutsches Wörterbuch.* Zweite umgearb. u. verm. Aufl. Halle, a. S., 1872–82.
Uhlenbeck, C. C. *Kurzgefasstes etymologisches Wörterbuch der gotischen Sprache.* Zweite verb. Aufl. Amsterdam, 1900.
Wilmanns, W. *Deutsche Grammatik: Gotisch, Alt-, Mittel- u. Neuhochdeutsch.* Zweite verb. Aufl. Strassburg, 1897 f.
Wood, Francis A. *Indo-European* $a^x : a^xi : a^xu$*: A Study in Ablaut and in Word-formation.* Strassburg, 1905.
——— *Color Names and Their Congeners.* Halle, 1902.

In addition I wish to express my thanks to Professor Francis A. Wood for helpful suggestions in the preparation of this work.

PART I

CLASS I

1. Goth. *beidan* 'erwarten'

OHG. *bīta* 'das verweilen,' OS. *bīdon* 'verweilen': OHG. *beitōn, beidōn*, MHG. *beiten* 'zögern,' MHG. *beit* 'das zögern': *bite* 'das stillhalten,' *biten* 'säumen, stillhalten.'

2. Goth. *beitan* 'beissen'

MHG. *bīzen* 'conglobare,' *bīz* 'keil': Goth. *baitrs* 'bitter,' OHG., MHG. *beizen* 'beizen': MHG. *verbizzen* 'verkeilen,' *durchbitzen* 'durchbeissen,' *durchbittern* 'mit bitterkeit durchdringen,' ON. *bitr*, OHG. *bittar* 'bitter.'

3. OHG. *erblīhhan* 'bleich werden'

OHG. *bleih*, MHG. *bleich* 'bleich,' OHG. *bleichen, bleichēn*, MHG. *bleichen* 'bleichen, blass werden': ON. *blikna* 'bleich werden,' OE. *blician* 'shine, appear.'

4. Goth. *dreiban* 'treiben'

OHG. *trīpāri* 'treiber,' *dana-trīp* 'repudium': Goth. *draibjan*, OE. *drœfan*, OHG. *treiben* 'treiben': ON. *drif* 'procella,' MHG. *trift* 'treiben.'

5. MHG. *vīsten* 'PEDERE'

MHG. *vīst* 'fist': *veist* 'fist, crepitus ventris,' *veisten* 'farzen': *vist* 'fist,' *visten* 'bombizare, pedere.' Cf. MHG. *vīsen* st. 'pedere,' ON. *fīsa* st. 'pedere,' Sw. *fisa*, Dan. *fise*, Eng. *fizz*, *fizzle*.

6. MHG. *gīgen* 'IN ZITTERNDE BEWEGUNG SETZEN'

MHG. *gīgen* 'sich hin u. her wiegen, geigen': ON. *geiga* 'zittern': MHG. *gigel*, *gickel* 'das zucken,' *gickeln* 'vor begierde, zorn beben, zucken' (Lexer I, 1014), E. *giggle* 'kichern.' Cf. *gagen*, *gugen* No. 557.

7. OE. *gīnan* 'YAWN'

OE. *gānian*, OHG. *geinōn*, MHG. *geinen* 'yawn,' OE. *tōgānan* 'utter': OHG. *ginēn*, *ginōn*, MHG. *ginen* 'gähnen,' ON. *gin* 'rachen der tiere,' OE. *gin* 'yawning gulf, abyss,' *ginian* 'gape.'

8. MHG. *glīfen* 'SCHRÄGE SEIN'

OHG. *gleifan*, MHG. *gleifen* 'schief machen,' MHG. *gleif* 'schief': *glipfen* 'gleiten,' MLG. *glippen* 'gleiten,' E. *glib* 'smooth.'

9. OFRIS. *glīsa* 'GLITTER'

OE. *glīsian* 'shine': *glisnian* 'glitter, glisten,' MHG. *glistern* 'scintillare,' E. *glister* 'glanz,' ON. *glis* 'glimmer.'

10. OHG. *glīzan* 'GLEISSEN, GLÄNZEN'

MHG. *glīz* 'glanz': ON. *glita*, *glitra* 'glitzern,' OHG. *glizinōn*, MHG. *glitzenen* 'glänzen,' *glitzern* the same, OE. *glitenian* 'glitter,' ON. *glit* 'glanz,' Goth. *glitmunjan* 'glänzen.'

11. OHG. *grīnan* 'KNURREN, WINSELN, WEINEN, LACHEN'

OE. *grānian* 'groan,' MHG. *greinen* fact. of *grīnen:* NHG. *grinsen*, E. *grin*.

12. GOTH. *greipan* 'GREIFEN'

OE. *grāpian* 'touch, handle, feel,' ON. *greipa* 'grasp,' OHG. *greifōn*, MHG. *greifen* 'greifen, tasten': *gripfen* 'wiederholt greifen,' ON. *gripr* 'eigentum, kleinod,' OHG. *grif* 'griff.' Cf. (**ghrei-p*) OE. *grǣfa* 'bramble,' *grāf* 'grove' (Wood, *Mod. Phil.* I, 241).

13. OHG. *līban* 'schonen'

Goth. *hleibjan*, OHG. *līban* 'schonen, schützen': OE. *hlāf-ord* 'protector, lord' (Wood, *A.J.P.* XXIII, 197).

14. OE. *hlīdan* 'cover'

OF. *hlidia*, MHG. *liden* 'mit einem deckel versehen, verdecken,' OE. *hlid*, OHG. *hlit* 'lid.'

15. Goth. *hneiwan*, OHG. *hnīgan* 'sich neigen'

Goth. *hnaiwjan* 'erniedrigen,' ON. *hneigja* 'inclinare,' OHG. *hneigan*, MHG. *neigen* 'neigen, senken,' OE. *hnāg* 'bowed down': ON. *hnigna* 'fall away,' OHG. *ginicchen*, MHG. *genicken* 'beugen, sich neigen.'

16. ON. **hnīpa* pp. *hnipenn* 'beklommen, niedergeschlagen'

ON. *hnīpa* 'hang the head, be sad,' *hnīpna* 'be cast down, sad': MHG. *nipfen* 'gleiten, stürzen, einnicken,' OE. *hnipian* 'to bow the head,' ON. *hnippa* 'stossen, stechen,' *hnipra* 'crouch,' MLG. *nipen*, E. *nip* 'kneifen.'

17. OHG. *hrīnan* 'berühren, in besitz nehmen'

OF. *hrēna* 'riechen, OHG. *ir-reinen* 'verschaffen, zu teil werden lassen': OE. *hrine* 'tactus.'

18. MHG. *kīben* 'keifen'

ON. *kīfa*, MHG. *kīp* 'scheltender zank,' *kīben* 'scheltend zanken': MHG. *kibelen*, *kivelen* 'scheltend zanken,' *kippen* 'schlagen, stossen.' Cf. ON. *kifinn* adj. remnant of a strong verb.

19. OHG. *klīban* 'festsitzen, kleben'

OHG. *klība*, OE. *clīfe* 'klette': OHG., MHG. *kleiben* 'festheften,' MHG. *kleip* 'leim, lehm': OE. *clifrian* 'kratzen,' OHG. *klebēn*, MHG. *kleben*, OE. *clifian* 'kleben, heften,' OS. *clivon* 'einwachsen,' ON. *klifra* 'klettern.'

20. OE. *cnīdan* beat

MHG. *knitschen* 'quetschen,' MHG. *knittern.*

21. MHG. *krīen* 'SCHREIEN'

MHG. *be-krīen* 'beschreien, *krīieren* 'den schlachtruf erheben': *kreiieren, kreigieren* 'ausrufen.' From the French *crier;* ablaut forms by analogy.

22. MG. *krīgen* 'SICH ANSTRENGEN, STREITEN'

MLG. *krīgen* 'streiten': MHG. *kriegen* 'sich anstrengen, streiten,' OHG. *chrēg* 'pertinacia' (MHG. *ie* = OHG. *ē* = IE. *ēi*).

23. MHG. *krīsen* 'KRIECHEN, SICH ALLMÄHLICH VERBREITEN'

MD. *crīselen* 'knirschen': MHG. *kriselen* 'krauen.' Cf. OHG. *kresan* 'kriechen' st. 5th class.

24. MHG. *krīschen* 'SCHARF SCHREIEN'

MHG. *krīschen* 'scharf schreien': *kreischen* 'aufschreien machen': NHG. *kriscbeln.*

25. MHG. *krīsten* 'STÖHNEN, ÄCHZEN'

ON. *kreista* 'drücken, pressen,' MHG. *kreisten* 'stöhnen.'

26. MHG. *krīzen* 'EINE KREISLINIE MACHEN, KRATZEN, SCHREIEN'

MHG. *kreizen* 'sich kreisförmig bewegen,' *kreizeln* 'kreisförmig machen': OHG. *krizzōn* 'einritzen,' MHG. *kriz* 'gekritzter strich; krach, geräusch.' Cf. MHG. *kreizen* 'kreischen machen, ärgern, zum zorn reizen,' *kreiz* 'schrei, lärm,' MLG. *kriten* 'streiten, zanken,' MHG. *krizeln* 'mit feiner stimme schreien.'

27. GOTH. *bi-leiban* 'ÜBRIG SEIN'

MHG. *līben* in *entlīben* 'entleiben,' OHG. *līb*, MHG. *līp* 'leben, leib': Goth. *bilaibjan* 'übrig lassen,' OHG. *leibēn*, OS. *lēƀon* 'bleiben,' MHG. *leiben* 'übrig lassen,' Goth. *laiba*, OHG. *leiba* 'überbleibsel': Goth. *liban*, OHG. *lebēn*, MHG. *leben* 'leben,' Goth. *aflifnan* 'übrig bleiben.'

28. GOTH. *leihwan* 'LEIHEN'

OHG. *lēhanōn*, MHG. *lēhenen* 'belehnen,' OHG. *lēhan* 'geliehenes gut,' OE. *lǣn*, E. *loan.*

29. Goth. *laikan* redup. 'hüpfen'

MHG. *leichen* 'hüpfen,' OHG. *gileik*, MHG. *geleich* 'gelenk': ON. *likna* 'bend back, give way.'

30. MHG. *ent-līmen* 'sich ablösen von'

OHG. *līman*, MHG. *līmen* 'zusammenleimen,' OHG. *līm* 'leim, vogelleim': OHG. *leim*, *leimo* 'lehm,' OE. *lām*, E. *loam* or cf. Wood, *Mod. Phil.* IV, 495.

31. Goth. *leiþan* 'gehen,' OHG. *līdan* 'leiden'

OHG. *leidēn*, MHG. *leiden* 'leid werden,' OHG. *leidōn*, MHG. *leiden* 'betrüben,' OHG. *leidjan*, MHG. *leiden* 'verhasst machen,' OHG. *leidegōn*, MHG. *leidegen* 'betrübt machen,' OHG. *leid* 'betrübend, leid, böse,' *leidsamen* 'vituperare.' Cf. OHG. *leitōn*, *leitan*, MHG. *leiten* 'leiten, führen': possibly OHG. *ledegōn*, MHG. *ledegen* 'erlösen, befreien,' *ledic* 'ledig, frei,' ON. *liðugr* 'frei, ungehindert.'

32. OHG. *mīdan* 'meiden, unterlassen'

Goth. *missō* 'gegenseitig,' *missa* 'verkehrt,' OHG. *missan*, MHG. *missen* 'entbehren, vermissen.'

33. OE. *ge-nīpan* 'dunkel werden'

Goth. *ga-nipnan* 'traurig werden,' OE. *genip* 'nebel.'

34. OHG. *rītan* 'fahren reiten'

MHG. *reiten* fact. of *rīten*, ON. *reiða* 'schwingen, wiegen,' *reið* 'Ritt,' OHG. *reita* 'kriegszug,' *reiten* 'fahren': *ritto* 'reiter,' MHG. *ritter*, *rittern* 'ritterlich kämpfen': *rītære*, *rītern* same.

35. OHG. *rīhan* 'reihen, fortlaufend verbinden'

MHG. *rīhe* 'reihe, linie': *reige* 'tanz,' OE. *rāw*, *rǣw* 'reihe, linie' (prob., cf. Kluge, *Et. Wb.*): MHG. *riggen*, *ricken* 'häufen,' *ricken* 'anbinden, zusammenreihen,' *ric* 'band, fessel,' OHG. *riga*, MHG. *rige* 'linie, reihe.'

36. OHG. *rīchan* 'herrschen'

OHG. *rīchēn*, MHG. *rīchen* 'herrschen, regieren,' OHG., MHG. *rīchen* 'reich machen,' OHG. *rīchisōn*, MHG. *rīchesen*

'herrschen,' Goth. *reiks* 'mächtig, vornehm': OHG. *reihhan*, *reichōn*, MHG. *reichen* 'erreichen, reichen,' OE. *rǣcean* 'reichen, recken.'

37. GOTH. *urreisan* 'AUFSTEHEN'

Goth. *urraisjan* 'aufstehen machen,' ON. *reisa* 'aufrichten,' OHG. *rērjan*, MHG. *rēren* 'fallen machen,' OE. *rǣran* 'raise, build, cause,' MHG. *reisen* 'bereiten, reisen': *riselen* 'in leichten tropfen niederfallen,' Goth. *urrists*, OHG. *urrist* 'auferstehung.'

38. OHG. *sīgan* 'TROPFEND FALLEN'

OHG. *seigan*, MHG. *seigen* 'senken, neigen; schleudern, werfen,' *seigern* 'die guten von den schlechten sondern,' ON. *seigr* 'tenacious,' OE. *sāgol* 'club, staff': ON. *signa* 'sink slowly, slip away,' OE. *sige* 'setting (of the sun).' Cf. *sīhan*, *sīfen* below.

39. OHG. *sīhan* 'SEIHEN'

ON. *sīa* 'durchseihen,' OHG. *sīha* 'seihe': MHG. *seihen*, *seigen* 'seihen.'

40. MG. *sīfen* 'TRÖPFELN'

LG. *sīpern* 'tröpfeln, sickern': MHG. *seifen* caus. of *sīfen*, *seifern* 'geifern,' OHG. *seifa* 'harz, seife,' MHG. *seifel*, *seifer* 'schaum, speichel': OE. *siftan* 'sichtan,' MHG. *sihten* 'sichten' from LG., *siffen* 'träufeln.' Cf. *sīhan*, *sīgan* above.

41. NORW. DIAL. *sīna* 'GLIDE, SLIP AWAY; SINK'

Goth. *sainjan* 'säumen, zögern,' MHG. *seinen* 'verspäten, versäumen.'

42. MHG. *schīben* 'ROLLEND FORTBEWEGEN'

OHG. *be-skīben*, MHG. *schīben* 'rollend fortbewegen': ON. *skīfa*, OHG. *skība* 'scheibe': ON. *skeifr* 'schief': MLG. *schivelen* 'schwanken, abfallen,' OE. *sciftan* 'divide, arrange,' E. *shift* 'schieben, bewegen, wenden,' ON. *skipta* 'schalten u. walten, teilen,' E. *shiver*.

43. MHG. *schīden* 'SCHEIDEN'

ON. *skīð*, OE. *scīd*, OHG. *skīt* 'scheit': Goth. *skaidan*, OHG. *sceidan*, MHG. *scheiden* redup. 'scheiden,' Goth. *gaskaidnan*

'sich scheiden,' OHG. *sceidōn*, MHG. *scheiden* 'scheiden,' OHG. *sceitilōn*, MHG. *scheitelen* 'scheiteln': OHG. *skidōn*, MHG. *schiden* 'scheiden, trennen.'

44. Goth. *skeinan* 'scheinen, leuchten'

OHG. *irsceinan*, MHG. *erscheinen* 'sichtbar machen, leuchten lassen,' *scheinen* 'zeigen': ON. *skin* 'glanz, schein.'

45. OHG. *scrīan* 'schreien'

OHG. *screiōn* 'schreien,' MHG. *schreien* 'schreien, schreien machen.' MHG. *schrīen* 'schreien' is weak also.

46. OHG. *scrīban* 'schreiben'

OHG. *scrībo* 'schreiber,' OHG. *scribilōn* 'scriptitare,' E. *scribble*, OHG. *scrift* 'schrift.'

47. Goth. *dis-skreitan* 'zerreissen'

Goth. *disskritnan* 'zerreissen,' Bav. *schritzen* 'schlitzen.'

48. OHG. *slīhhan* 'schleichen'

OHG. *sleihhan*, MHG. *sleichen* 'heimlich wohin bringen,' MHG. *sleichen* 'den schlamm entfernen,' ON. *sleikja* 'lecken': MHG. *slicken*, *slichen* 'schlingen, schlucken,' OHG. *slihtan*, MHG. *slihten* 'gerade machen, glätten,' OHG. *slihtī* 'schlichtheit,' MHG. *slecken* 'naschen.'

49. OHG. *slīfan* 'gleiten, gleitend sinken'

OHG. *sleifa* 'schleife,' *sleifan*, MHG. *sleifen* 'gleiten machen,' *sleif* 'schlüpfrig,' E. *slope* 'neigen, senken': OHG. *sliffan*, MHG. *slipfen* 'ausgleiten,' OE. *slipig* 'slimy.'

50. OHG. *slīzan* 'reissen, spalten'

OHG. *sleizan*, MHG. *sleizen* 'sich spalten,' ON. *sleita* 'streit, ränke': OHG. *slizzen* 'einen schlitz machen,' MHG. *slitzen* 'reissen,' OHG. *sliz* 'schlitz.'

51. Goth. *bi-smeitan* 'beschmieren, bestreichen'

OHG. *pesmeizen* 'besudeln,' MHG. *smeizen* 'schmeissen': OHG. *pismizjan*, MHG. *besmitzen* 'bestreichen, beschmieren, beschmeissen,' OHG. *smiz*, MHG. *smitze*, OE. *smitta* 'fleck.'

52. OSw. *smīþa* 'SCHMIEDEN'

OHG. *smīda*, MHG. *gesmīde* 'metall': OHG. *smeidar* 'metallkünstler': Goth. *gasmiþōn*, OHG. *smidōn*, MHG. *smiden* 'schmieden,' Goth. *aiza-smiþa*, OHG. *smid* 'schmied.'

53. GOTH. *sneiþan* 'SCHNEIDEN, ERNTEN'

OHG. *sneitōn*, MHG. *sneiten* 'beschneiden,' *sneiteln* 'abramescere,' OHG. *sneita*, *sneida* 'gehauener weg': MHG. *snitzen*, *snitzeln* 'in stücke schneiden,' *snitzel* 'schnitzel.'

54. OHG. *snīwan* 'SCHNEIEN'

MHG. *snīwen*, *snīen* 'schneien,' MHG. *snīfen* 'mit schnee bedecken?': Goth. *snaiws*, OHG. *snēo*, MHG. *snē* 'schnee.'

55. GOTH. *speiwan* 'SPEIEN, SPUCKEN'

MHG. *spīen* 'speien': *speien* 'bespeien, verspotten,' Goth. *spaiskuldr* 'speichel.' Cf. MHG. *spiutzen*, *spūtzen* from *spiwezen*, *spiuwezen*, *spūwezen* (Kluge, *Et. Wb. speutzen* = *spiwitjan?*). From *spīwen* came the MHG. forms *spūwen*, etc. (**spīwan*>**spiuwan*>**spūwan*).

56. MHG. *sprīten* 'AUSBREITEN, SPREITEN'

OHG. *spreitan*, MHG. *spreiten* 'ausbreiten,' OHG. *spreid* 'busch,' MHG. *spreide* 'ausdehnung, busch,' OE. *sprǣdan* 'spread.'

57. OHG. *sprīzen* 'SPLITTERN, SPRINGEND AUSEINANDERGEHEN'

OHG. *sprīzalōn*, MHG. *sprīzeln* 'splittern,' OHG. *sprīzal* 'holzsplitter': ON. *sprita* 'sprawl.'

58. GOTH. *steigan* 'STEIGEN'

OHG. *stīgōn* 'einstallen, in den stall sperren,' *stīga*, 'steig, stufe, stall': MHG. *steigen* 'erhöhen,' early NHG. *steigern* 'steigern, den preis erhöhen,' Goth. *staiga* 'steig': OHG. *stegeren* 'steigen,' *stegōn* 'steg betreten,' MHG. *stegen*, *stec.*

59. OHG. *strītan* 'STREITEN'

OS. *strīdian* 'streiten': MHG. *striten* 'schreiten.'

60. OHG. *strīhhan* 'STREICHEN'

MHG. *strīchen* pp. 'gestrichen, geebnet, geputzt,' *strīch* 'streich, schlag': OHG. *streichōn*, MHG. *streichen* 'streifen, berühren, streicheln': Goth. *striks*, OHG., MHG. *strich*, OE. *strica* 'stroke, mark.'

61. GOTH. *sweiban* 'AUFHÖREN, ABLASSEN'

OHG. *sweibōn*, MHG. *sweiben* 'schweben, schweifen,' MHG. *sweibeln* 'schwanken,' ON. *sueifla* 'swing, spin': MHG. *swibelen* 'taumeln,' OHG. *swiftōn* 'become still,' MHG. *beswiften* 'beschwichtigen.' Cf. MHG. *swīfen* st., No. 66.

62. MHG. *verswīgen* 'SCHWEIGEN'

OHG. *farswīkēn*, MHG. *verswīgen* 'verschweigen,' OHG. *swīgēn*, MHG. *swīgen* 'schweigen, verstummen,' OE. *swīgian* 'schweigen': OHG. *giswеigan*, MHG. *gesweigen*, 'zum schweigen bringen,' ON. *sueigia* 'bow, bend': ON. *suig* 'bend, curve.' MHG. *verswīgen* is probably a restored strong form. Cf. the following.

63. OHG. *swīhhan* 'ERMATTEN, EINEN VERLASSEN'

OHG. *swīhhōn*, MHG. *swīchen* 'schweifen,' OE. *swīcung* 'deceit': MHG. *sweichen* 'ermatten, nachlassen': OE. *swician* 'wander, deceive, depart,' OHG. *bi-swihhida* 'deceptio, fraus,' ON. *swic* 'fraus.'

64. MHG. *swīmen* 'SCHWINDELN'

MHG. *swīmeln* 'schwindeln,' OE. *swīma* 'schwindel': MHG. *sweimen* 'sich schwingen, schweifen,' *versweimeln* 'schwindlig werden': MHG. *swimelen*, *swimmeln* 'schwindeln,' ON. *suimi* 'schwindel.'

65. OHG. *swīnan* 'SCHWINDEN, WELKEN, ABNEHMEN'

OHG. *sweinan*, MHG. *sweinen* 'verringern, schwächen': ON. *suina* from an orig. st. *suīna* 'subside' cf. Cleasby-Vigf. Compare OHG. *swintan* 'schwinden,' No. 224.

66. MHG. *swīfen* 'SCHWINGEN (VOM PFERD, ETC.)'

Goth. *midja-sweipains* 'sindflut': OHG., MHG. *sweif* 'schwung, drehende bewegung,' MHG. *sweifen* 'schweifen, schwingen,' OHG.

sweifan redup. 'schleifen, schweifen,' ON. *sueipa* wk. irreg. 'schwingen, fegen, wickeln,' *sueipr* 'lockig': OHG. *swipfen* 'rasche wendung machen,' OE. *swipian, swippan* 'scourge, strike, lash,' *swipu* 'a scourge.'

67. GOTH. *ga-teihan* 'ANZEIGEN, ERZÄHLEN'

OHG. *zeiga* 'anweisung,' *zeigōn* 'zeigen': *ziht* 'anklage,' MHG. *zic* 'beschuldigung,' OHG. *gi-inzihtīgōn* 'beschuldigen,' MHG. *verzicken* 'bezichtigen, verdächtigen.' Cf. Goth. *taiknjan* 'zeigen,' OHG. *zeihnan* 'bezeichnen.'

68. GOTH. *þreihan* 'DRÄNGEN'

MHG. *drīhen* 'mit der sticknadel arbeiten,' Goth. *þreihsl* 'bedrängnis': *-þraihns* 'gedränge, haufe.' Cf. OS. *thrēgian* 'drohen' (Wood, *Mod. Phil.*, V, 267). Cf. also OHG. *dringan* 'dringen' No. 235, of the third series to which *þreihan* (**þrinh-*) orig. belonged.

69. GOTH. *weihan* 'KÄMPFEN'

Goth. *waihjō* 'kampf,' OHG. *weigerōn*, MHG. *weigeren* 'sich weigern,' OHG. *weigan*, MHG. *weigen* 'belästigen, quälen,' ON. *veig* 'stärke': Goth. *wigana* 'kampf, krieg.' Cf. OHG. *ubarwehan* gegen einen kämpfen st. 5th class.

70. OHG. *wīhhan* 'WEICHEN'

OHG. *wīhhōn* 'springen, hüpfen, tanzen': *geweichēn*, MHG. *geweichen* 'weich werden,' OHG. *weihhan*, MHG. *weichen* 'weich machen': MHG. *wichen, wiheren* 'hüpfen, springen.' Cf. OHG. *wehsalōn* 'wechsel,' *wehha*, Goth. *wikō* 'woche.'

71. GOTH. *weipan* 'BEKRÄNZEN'

OHG. *wīffa* 'strohwisch als warnungszeichen': Goth. *faurwaipjan* 'verbinden,' MHG. *weifen* 'schwingen,' Goth. *waips* 'kranz, krone,' OHG. *waif* 'binde': MHG. *wipfen, wepfen* 'hüpfen, springen,' Goth. *wipja* 'kranz.' Cf. Goth. *biwaibjan* 'umwinden,' OHG. *weibōn* 'schwanken.'

72. **wīsan*, ON. PP. *visenn* 'VERDORRT'

ON. *visna*, OHG. *wesanēn* 'welken.'

73. Goth. *fraweitan* 'rächen'

Goth. *fair-weitjan* 'umherspähen,' OHG. *ita-wīzjan*, MHG. *ite-wīzen* 'schmähen, schelten,' OHG. *wīzinōn*, MHG. *wīzenen*, *wīzegen* 'strafen,' OHG. *wīzōn*, *wīzagōn* 'prophetizare': OHG. *weizen* 'zeigen, beweisen, vorwerfen': Goth. *witan* pret. pres. 'wissen,' *witan* wk. 'auf etwas sehen,' OHG. *wizzēn*, *wizzan*, MHG *wizzen*, 'wissen,' OHG. *wizzēn*, MHG. *witzen* 'verständig sein, machen.' Cf. *fullaweisjan*, No. 358.

74. OE. *wlītan* 'look'

Goth. *wlaitōn* 'sich umsehen': Goth. *wlits* 'angesicht,' OHG. *antlizzi*, MHG. *antlitze*, 'antlitz,' MHG. *antlitzen*, 'mit einem antlitz versehen,' *litzen* 'leuchten.'

75. OE. *wrītan* 'schreiben'

OHG. *reizen*, MHG. *reizen* 'reizen, anregen, locken,' OHG. *reiz*, linie: OHG. *rizzan*, *rizzōn*, MHG. *ritzen*, 'ritzen, stechen,' Goth. *writs* 'strich, punkt,' OHG. *riz* 'strich,' MHG. *riz* 'riss, ritze,' E. *writ* 'schrift.'

76. OHG. *rīdan* 'drehen'

MHG. *reiden* 'sich kräuseln, welken,' OHG. *reid*, *reidi* 'lockicht, kraus,' MHG. *reit:* OHG. *ridilōn* 'trennen,' MHG. *ridieren* kräuseln, fälteln,' OHG. *ridil* 'haarband,' OE. *wriða* 'reif, ring.'

CLASS II

77. Goth. *anabiudan* 'entbieten'

MHG. *erböten* 'anbieten,' OHG. *boto*, MHG. *bote* 'bote,' *verboten* 'besenden.'

78. Goth. *biugan* 'biegen'

OHG. *biogēn* 'gebogen sein, sich krümmen,' MHG.-*biugen* 'beugen': Goth. *usbaugjan* 'ausfegen,' OHG. *bougen*, MHG. *bōugen* 'biegen, krümmen,' MHG. *bouc* 'ring': Goth. *bugjan* 'kaufen,' OHG. *bogo* 'bogen,' *pogen*, MHG. *bogen* 'krumm sein,' MHG. *bocken* 'niedersinken,' *bucken* 'bücken,' OHG. *buhil* 'hügel.' Cf. OE. *būgan* st. 'bow down, stoop.'

79. OE. *bēatan* REDUP. 'BEAT, CLASH TOGETHER'

ON. *būta*, MHG. *biuzen* 'hauen,' ON. *būtr* 'log,' MHG. *būz* 'schlag': ON. *bauta* redup. 'erschlagen,' OHG. *pōzan*, MHG. *bōzen* redup. and weak 'stossen schlagen,' MHG. *bōzeln* 'klopfen,' *bōz*, 'schlag': MHG. *boz* 'schlag,' *butze* 'poltergeist,' Low. G. *butt* 'stumpf.' Cf. MHG. *būden* 'schlagen, klopfen.'

80. MHG. *verbliehen* 'BURN UP, FADE AWAY'

OHG. *bluhen* 'burn, glow.'

81. OE. *brēotan* 'BREAK'

MHG. *brozzen* 'knospen treiben,' *broz* 'knospe': ON. *breyta* 'alter, change.'

82. MHG. *briuwen* 'BRAUEN'

MHG. *briuwen* 'brauen': cf. MHG. *brodeln*, *brudeln* 'brodeln, sieden,' *brod* 'brühe.'

83. GOTH. *bauan* 'WOHNEN,' REDUP., 3 SING. *bauiþ*.

Goth. *bauan* 'wohnen,' OHG. *būwan*, *būan*, MHG. *būwen*, *biuwen: bouwen* 'wohnen, bebauen.' Cf. MHG. *buoden* 'eine bude aufschlagen,' ON. *būð* 'wohnung.'

84. GOTH. *daug* PRET. PRES. 'TAUGEN'

MHG. *tougen* 'taugen': OHG. *tugan*, MHG. *tugen*, *tügen* 'taugen, tüchtig sein,' *tuht* 'tüchtigkeit,' OE. *dyhtig* 'strong.' Cf. MHG. *tugenden* 'tugend zeigen.'

85. OHG. *triugan* 'TRÜGEN'

ON. *draugr* 'gespenst': MHG. *getroc* 'gespenst,' OHG. *truganōn* 'trügen,' MHG. *trogen*, cf. *unbetroget* 'aufrichtig.'

86. GOTH. *driugan* 'VOLLFÜHREN'

Goth. *draúhtinōn* 'kriegsdienste tun,' OHG. *truht* 'gefolge.'

87. OHG. *triufan*, 'TRIEFEN, TROPFEN'

OHG. *trouf* 'traufe, *troufan*, MHG. *tröufen* 'triefen lassen, träufeln': OHG. *tropho* 'tropf,' *trophōn*, MHG. *tropfen* 'tropfen,' *tröpfeln*, OHG. *trophezen*, MHG. *tropfezen* 'tröpfeln.'

88. Goth. *driusan* 'fallen'

OE. *drūsian* 'become languid, sluggish,' OHG. *trūrēn*, MHG. *trūren* 'trauern,' OHG. *trūreg* 'traurig,' *trūregōn*, MHG. *trūrigen* 'traurig werden': Goth. *driuso* 'abhang': Goth. *afdrausjan* 'herabwerfen,' OHG. *trōran* 'tröpfeln': OS. *drusinon*, OHG. *trusanōn* 'auspressen,' *trusana* 'bodensatz,' Goth. *drus* 'fall.'

89. **dūban*, ON. pp. *dofenn* 'erschlafft'

OHG. *tūbar* 'albern, töricht': Goth. *afdaubnan* 'taub werden,' *gadaubjan* 'taub machen,' MHG. *touben* 'taub werden,' *toubieren* 'wie ein tauber musizieren,' Goth. *daufs* 'taub,' *daubei*, *daubiþa* 'taubheit,' OHG. *toub* 'taub': OHG. *tobōn*, *tobēn* 'rasen,' OHG., MHG. *tob* 'nicht bei verstand sein.' Cf. Goth. *dumbs*.

90. OHG. *tūhhan* 'tauchen'

MHG. *tūchen* 'tauchen': *betouchen* 'mit wasser bedeckt werden': OHG. *tocchen*, MHG. *tocken* 'flatternd sich hin u. her bewegen,' *tucken*, *tücken* 'schnelle bewegung nach unten machen,' *tokzen*, *tokzeln* 'schwanken,' NHG. *ducken* from LG., E. *duck*.

91. OHG. *fliogan* 'fliegen'

Goth. *usflaugjan* 'emporfliegen machen,' ON. *fleygja*, OHG. *flaugan*, MHG. *vlougen*, MG. *vlōgen* 'fliegen machen': OHG. *flogarōn*, *flogarrazzan*, *flogezen*, MHG. *vlogzen* 'flattern, schimmern,' *zervlockeren* 'hin u. her flattern,' OE. *flogettan* 'fluctuate,' OHG. *flucchen* 'flügge machen,' *flucchēn*, MHG. *vlücken* 'flügge sein,' *vlocken* 'fliegen, auffliegen machen,' *vlügelen* 'mit flügeln versehen.'

92. OHG. *fliozan* 'fliessen, strömen'

MHG. *vliez* 'fluss, strömung': MHG. *vlōz* 'flut, strom,' OHG. *flōzzan*, MHG. *vlœzen* 'flössen': OE. *floterian* 'float, fly, flutter, OHG. *fluz* 'strömung,' *flozza* 'flosse.' Cf. Goth. *flōdus*, OE. *flōwan*, MHG. *verfluoten* 'überschwemmen,' *vlüeten*, *vlüejen* 'strömen, fliessen.'

93. OE. *fnēosan* 'sneeze'

MHG. *phnūsen* 'schnauben': *phnust* 'losbrechen beim lachen,' *phnurren* 'schnauben, brummen.'

94. OHG. *freosan* 'FRIEREN'

OHG. *frōren*, MHG. *vrœren* 'frieren machen,' OHG. *frost* 'frost,' *irfrostēn* 'erfrieren.'

95. OE. *gēopan* 'SWALLOW'

MHG. *giefen* 'törichtes betragen,' *gief* 'tor, narr': ON. *gaupa* 'luchs': MHG. *güffen*, *güften*, *guffen* 'seine freude laut äussern,' *guft* 'lautes rufen' (cf. Wood, *IE.* a^x: $a^x i$: $a^x u$ 105).

96. GOTH. *giutan* 'GIESSEN'

Goth. *usgutnan* 'gegossen werden,' OHG. *guzjan* 'einen guss machen,' *ubar-gussōn* 'affluere,' *gussi* 'überschwemmung,' MHG. *güsseln* 'fliessen, strömen': OE. *gīetan* 'destroy.'

97. ON. *hliōta* 'ERLANGEN, ERLOSEN'

MHG. *lōzen* 'durch los bestimmen,' OHG. *hlōz* 'los': *hluz* 'durch los zugefügter anteil,' ON. *hlutr* 'los.'

98. OHG. *hniutan* 'BEFESTIGEN, HÄMMERN'

MHG. *nieten* 'mit nägeln befestigen,' *niet* 'breitgeschlagener nagel': OHG. *hnōtōn* 'quassare': Goth. *hnuþō* 'stachel.' Cf. OE. *hnossian* 'beat.'

99. GOTH. *dishniupan* 'ZERREISSEN'

OE. *āhnēapan* redup. 'abpflücken': ON. *hnupla* 'wegraufen, mausen,' Goth. *dishnupnan* 'zerrissen werden.'

100. ON. *hriōða* 'STÜRZEN, LOSFAHREN'

OE. *hrēod*, OHG. (*h*)*riot* 'rohr': MHG. *rütten*, *rütteln* 'schütteln' (cf. Wood, *IE.* a^x, etc., 89).

101. ON. *hriōta* 'FALLEN, LOSFAHREN,' OE. *hrūtan* 'RESOUND, SNORE'

OHG. *rūzōn*, MHG. *rūzen* 'rasseln, schnauben': ON. *hreyta* 'hinwerfen, zerstreuen.'

102. OHG. *hriuwan* 'SCHMERZ, REUE EMPFINDEN'

OHG. *hriuwōn*, *riuwēn*, MHG. *riuwen* 'klagen, bereuen': MG. *rouwe* 'reue.' Cf. MHG. *riwe* 'reue,' OS. *hriwōn* which show forms of the fifth class.

103. **hūkan*, ON. *hokenn* PP. 'GEBÜCKT'

MHG. *hūchen* 'hocken, kauern': Norw. *hauken* 'sickly looking,' MHG. *hocker* 'höcker, buckel,' NHG. *hocken*.

104. GOTH. *kiusan* 'PRÜFEN, WÄHLEN'

Goth. *kausjan* 'kosten, schmecken': OHG. *corōn*, *chorōn* 'kosten, prüfen,' MHG. *bekürn* 'zur prüfung herbeiziehen,' *erkosen* 'erwählen,' OHG. *kostōn*, MHG. *kosten* 'prüfend beschauen,' *chora*, *chorunga* 'prüfung,' *kür* 'prüfende wahl,' Goth. *gakusts* 'prüfung.'

105. OHG. *chiuwan* 'KAUEN'

OHG. *chiuwa* 'kiefer,' OHG. *cachauwarōn* 'consumere.'

106. OHG. *clioban* 'SPALTEN, KLIEBEN'

OHG. *klūbōn*, MHG. *klūben*, *kliuben* 'pflücken, zerreissen, abklauben,' MHG. *kliubelen* 'mit knöcheln spielen': *klouben* same as *klūben*, *klouber* 'klaue, kralle': *kloben* 'spalten,' OHG. *klobo* 'bündel.'

107. OHG. *kriohhan* 'KRIECHEN'

ME. *crouchen* (= Germ. *ū*), E. *crouch* 'sich ducken, bücken': MHG. *krōuchen* 'kriechen': ON. *kroka* 'sich krümmen,' MHG. *krücken* 'mit krücken versehen,' OHG. *krucka*, OE. *crycc* 'krücke,' E. *crotch* 'haken, gabel.'

108. OE. *crūdan* 'CROWD, PRESS'

MLG. *krūt: krōt* 'hindernis, belästigung': OHG. *kroten*, *kruden* 'bedrängen, belästigen,' MHG. *krōten*, *kruden* 'belästigen.'

109. GOTH. *liudan* 'WACHSEN'

OHG. *liut* 'volk,' MHG. *liuten* 'bevölkern': OS. *lūd* 'äusseres': Goth. *laudi* 'gestalt,' MHG. *lōte* 'beschaffen': Goth. *ludja* 'antlitz.'

110. GOTH. *liugan* 'LÜGEN'

Goth. *laugnjan*, OS. *lōgnian*, OHG. *lauganen*, MHG. *lougenen* 'leugnen,' OHG. *lougna* 'läugnung': OS. *lugina*, OHG. *lugin*, *lug* 'lüge.'

111. GOTH. *fraliusan* 'VERLIEREN'

Goth. *lausjan* 'lösen, erlösen,' OHG. *arlōsan* 'erlösen,' MHG. *lōsen* 'los sein,' *lœsen* 'lösen,' *lōsunge* 'lösegeld, pfand,' Goth.

laus 'los, leer': *fralusnan* 'verloren gehen,' OHG. *forlorjan* 'verderben,' *forlor* 'verderben,' Goth. *fralusts*, OHG. *forlust* 'verlust.' Cf. Goth. *lēwjan* 'verraten,' *lēw* 'gelegenheit.'

112. GOTH. *galūkan* 'SCHLIESSEN'

MHG. *belouchen* 'schliessen': Goth. *galuknan* 'verschlossen werden,' *usluks* 'öffnung.' Cf. MHG. *lūhten* 'zupfen.'

113. ON. *lūta* 'SICH BEUGEN, NEIGEN'

OE. *lūtian*, OHG. *lūzēn* 'verborgen liegen': Goth. *liuts* 'heuchlerisch': *lutōn* 'betrügen,' OHG. *luzzen* 'klein machen,' *luzzil* 'klein.'

114. GOTH. *niutan* 'ERLANGEN, GENIESSEN'

OHG. *genōzōn* 'gesellen zu, gleichstellen mit,' MHG. *genōzen* 'teil haben an, geniessen': OHG. *ginuzzen*, MHG. *genützen* 'benutzen, gebrauchen,' OHG. *nuz*, MHG. *nutz* 'nutzen, gebrauch,' Goth. *nuta* 'fänger, fischer.'

115. OE. *rēodan* 'RÖTEN'

Goth. *gariuds* 'ehrbar,' OE. *rēod* 'rot,' ON. *riōðr* 'rot,' OE. *ārēodian* 'errōten': OE. *rūde* 'rōte': Goth. *raups*, OHG. *rōt* 'rot,' OHG. *rōten*, MHG. *rœten* 'rot machen,' OHG. *rōtēn*, MHG. *rōten* 'rot werden': OHG. *rotēn*, MHG. *roten* 'errōten,' OHG. *rutihhōn* 'rötlich sein.' Cf. *rost* (Kluge, *Et. W.*), OHG. *rostagēn*, MHG. *rosten* 'rostig werden.'

116. OE. *rēofan* 'BRECHEN, ZERREISSEN'

Goth. *bi-raubōn* 'berauben,' ON. *raufa*, OE. *rēafian*, OS. *rōbon*, OHG. *roubōn*, MHG. *rouben* 'rauben': E. Fries. *rubben* 'reiben, kratzen, reissen, raufen,' E. *rub*.

117. OHG. *riuhhan* 'RAUCHEN, DAMPFEN'

MHG. *riecheln* 'fragrare': OHG. *rouhhan*, MHG. *rouchen* 'rauch machen, riechen,' OHG. *rouh* 'rauch': MHG. *ruch* 'dampf, dunst.'

118. **reutan*, ON. PP. *rotenn* 'ROTTEN'

OHG. *rōzen* 'verwesen, faulen,' MHG, *rœzen*, *rōzen* 'welk, bleich, faul werden': OHG. *rozēn* 'verwesen, faulen,' OE. *rotian* 'rot.'

119. Goth. *siukan* 'kranken'

Goth. *siuks* 'krank, schwach,' OHG. *ir-siuchēn* 'krank werden,' *siechelōn*, *siechēn*, *siechōn*, MHG. *siecheln*, *siechen*, MG. *sūcheln* 'siechen': OHG. *suht* 'sucht,' Goth. *saúhts*. Cf. MHG. *swachen*, *swechen* 'schwach sein, machen.'

120. OHG. *siodan* 'sieden'

MHG. *sœden* 'ein sieden machen,' *sōdem* 'brennen des magens,' Goth. *saubs* 'opfer': Late MHG. *sudelen* 'beschmutzen, schlecht kochen,' *suttern* 'im kochen überwallen,' *sut* 'das sieden.' Johansson (*PBB.*, XV, 237) puts Goth. *subjan*, *subjōn*, 'kitzel empfinden' and *subn* 'magen' here. Cf. OHG. *swedan* st. 'langsam brennen.'

121. Goth. *afskiuban* 'wegschieben'

OHG. *scūvala*, MHG. *schūvel* 'schaufel,' ON. *skūfa* 'to turn out': OHG. *scoub*, MHG. *schoup*, OE. *scēaf* 'sheaf': OHG. *verscupfen* 'wegstossen,' MHG. *schupfen*, *schüpfen* 'stossen, schleudern,' OE. *scofian* 'shove,' E. *scuffle*, *shuffle*, MHG. *schopf*, Goth. *skuft*, ON. *skopt* 'haupthaar,' OHG. *scoppōn*, MHG. *schopfen* 'stopfen,' *schoben* 'schubweise tätig sein,' *schoberen*, *schuberen*, *schubelen* 'häufen,' *schober* 'schober,' *schupf* 'schwung.'

122. OHG. *sciozan* 'schiessen'

MHG. *schōzen* 'hüpfen,' Goth. *skauts* 'saum des kleides, zipfel,' OHG. *scōz* 'kleidschoss': *scozōn* 'niederschiessen, wie ein geschoss dahinfliegen, early NHG. *schozzen* 'spriessen; steuer zahlen,' MHG. *schoz* 'schosz, steuer,' OHG. *scoz*, MHG. *schoz* 'geschoss,' OHG. *scuzzo* 'schütze.'

123. MHG. *sliechen* 'schlüpfen'

MHG. *slūchen* 'schlingen, schlucken,' *slūch* 'abgestreifte haut, schlauch, schlund,' E. *slouch:* ON. *slauka* 'slip through with difficulty': MHG. *slucken* 'schlingen, schlucken,' intens. *sluckzen*, *sluckezen*, *slücke* 'öffnung,' ON. *sloka* 'swallow.'

124. Goth. *sliupan* 'schlüpfen, schleichen'

Goth. *afslaupjan* 'abstreifen,' OE. *slīepan* 'slip,' OHG. *sloufen*, MHG. *slöufen* 'schlüpfen lassen,' *sloufe* 'öffnung, kreis, beklei-

dung': ON. *slupra* 'schlürfen,' OHG. *intslupfen* 'entschlüpfen,' MHG. *slüpfen* 'schlüpfen, schlürfen,' *sluppern* iter., OE. *slyppe* 'slime,' E. *slop*.

125. OHG. *sliozan* 'SCHLIESSEN'

MHG. *slōz* 'band, fessel': *beslützen* 'einschliessen,' *ver-slüzzen* 'abschliessen,' *sloz* 'band, fessel.'

126. ON. *smiūga* 'DURCH ETWAS KRIECHEN'

MHG. *smougen* 'sich ducken': *smücken*, *smucken* 'schmiegen,' *smogen* 'auf die seite schaffen.' Cf. OE. *smūgan* st.

127. OE. *snēowan* 'EILEN'

ON. *snūa* redup. 'wenden, drehen': MHG. *snŏuwen* 'schnauben.' Cf. OHG. *farsniumōn* 'eilen,' OE. *snēome* 'suddenly, quickly,' Goth. *sniumjan* 'eilen.' Cf. also Goth. *sniwan* st. 'eilen' No. 289, MHG. *snāwen* 'schnauben' which belong to the fifth class whence the above have come. The forms of the second class may have been influenced in meaning by *snūden*, *snūfen*, etc. Cf. the following.

128. MHG. *snūben*, *snūfen* 'SCHNARCHEN, SCHNAUFEN'

OHG. *snophizan*, late MHG. *snupfezen*, *snupfen* 'schluchzen,' *snupfe* 'schnupfen,' LG. *besnoppern* 'beschnobern,' OSw. *snuppa* 'schluchzen,' E. *snuff*, *snuffle*, *snub*. These forms represent germ. **snupp-*, **snŭf-*: **snŭb-*.

129. MHG. *snūden* 'SCHNAUBEN'

MHG. *sniudeln* 'anschnaufen,' OHG. *nasesnūden* 'schnaufen,' MHG. *snūde* 'katarrh,' *snouden* 'das schnaufen': *snuden* 'schnaufen,' *snuderen* 'schnarchen,' *snodelen* 'durch die verstopfte nase atmen,' *snudel* 'katarrh.' Cf. *sniwan*, No. 289.

130. MHG. *spriezen* 'SPRIESSEN'

OHG. *spriuzan*, MHG. *spriuzen* 'stützen,' *spriuze* 'stütze': Goth. *sprauto* 'schnell,' ON. *spreyta* 'to have a boasting manner': OE. *spryttan*, MHG. *sprützen* 'spritzen, sprossen,' OHG. *sprozo*, MHG. *sprozze* 'spross.' Cf. OE. *ā- sprūtan* st. 'sprout.'

131. OHG. *stioban* 'rennen, stieben'

OHG. *stouban*, MHG. *stöuben* 'staub erregen, stieben machen,' *stöuber* 'jagdhund,' OHG., MHG. *stoub* 'staub': MHG. *stüppen*, *stuppen* 'zu staub machen,' OHG. *stuppi*, MHG. *stüppe*, Goth. *stubjus* 'staub,' MHG. *stöbern* 'aufstöbern.'

132. Goth. *stautan* redup. 'stossen'

OHG. *stōzōn* 'stimulare, concutere': MHG. *stutzen* 'stutzen, zurückscheuen.' Cf. OHG. *stiuz* 'steiss.'

133. ON. *striūka* 'streichen, bestreichen'

OHG. *strūhhōn*, MHG. *strūchen* 'straucheln,' *strūch* 'das straucheln,' MHG. *strūchelen* 'straucheln, stolpern': OE. *stroccian* 'stroke.'

134. MHG. *striefen* 'streifen'

OSw. *strūpe:* ON. *striupe* 'throat': OE. *bestrīepan* 'strip, rob,' OHG., MHG. *stroufen* 'streifen, stringere': MHG. *strupfen* 'streifen, abrupfen.' Cf. MHG. *strumpf* 'stummel.'

135. OE. *strūdan* 'plunder, ravage'

MHG. *strūten* 'rauben, plündern': OHG. *struten* 'rauben,' MG. *struterie* 'räuberei.'

136. ON. *stūpa* 'hervorragen'

MG. *stūpe* 'schandpfahl': OE. *stīepan* 'errichten,' *stīepel* 'turm' (=**staup-*): OHG. *stupfen* 'leicht stossen, stacheln,' MHG. *stupfen*, *stüpfen* 'stechend stossen, stopfen,' OE. *forstoppian* 'stop up, close,' *stofn* 'stem' (cf. Wood, *IE.* a^x:a^xi etc., p. 132).

137. OHG. *sūgan* 'saugen'

MHG. *sūgen* (weak also) 'saugen': OHG. *sougen*, MHG. *sougen*, *söugen* 'säugen': *suggeln* 'in kleinen zügen saugen,' NHG. *suckeln* intens. zu *saugen*. Cf. E. *swig* and OE. *sūcan* st. 'suck,' E. *suck*.

138. OHG. *sūfan* 'schlürfen, trinken'

MHG. *sūfezen* 'sip,' OHG. *sūfteōn* 'seufzen,' *sūf* 'brühe, suppe,' MHG. *siuften*, *siufzen*, *siufen* 'seufzen': OHG. *souffen*, MHG. *soufen* 'untertauchen, versenken': Goth. *supōn*, OHG. *sofōn*

'würzen' (cf. Wood, *Mod. Lang. Notes*, XV, 96), *sophā*, MHG. *sophe* 'brühe, suppe,' OHG. *suphjan*, MHG. *supfen* 'schlürfen.'

139. GOTH. *tiuhan* 'ZIEHEN, FORTZIEHEN'

OHG. *zōhen*, MHG. *zœhen* 'ziehen machen, treiben,' OE. *tēam* 'nachkommenschaft': MHG. *zühtigen* 'strafen,' *zühten* 'nähren, aufziehen,' OHG. *zucchen*, *zocchōn*, *zocharōn*, MHG. *zocken*, *zochen*, *zücken* 'ziehen, zerren, reizen.' Cf. OHG. *geziugōn*, No. 429.

140. MG. *zūwen* 'ziehen'

MG. *zūwen* 'ziehen': Goth. *taujan* 'bewirken, machen,' OHG. *zouwen*, *zoujan* 'verfertigen,' MHG. *zouwen* 'tun, fertig machen, sich beeilen.' Cf. Goth. *tēwa* 'ordnung,' OHG. *zawēn* 'von statten gehn.' *Zūwen*, orig. a weak verb is strong by analogy.

141. OHG. *diozan* 'TOSEN, RAUSCHEN'

OHG. *dōzōn* 'intonare,' *dōz* 'schall,' MHG. *erdœzen* 'schallen, klingen machen': MHG. *duz* 'schall, geräusch.' Cf. OE. *pūtan* st.

142. GOTH. *pliuhan* 'FLIEHEN'

MHG. *vlœhen*, *vlœhenen* 'flüchten,' OHG. *flōh*, MHG. *vlōch* 'flōh': OHG. *fluhten* 'wegtreiben,' MHG. *vlucht*, OE. *flyht*, E. *flight*.

143. GOTH. *uspriutan* 'BESCHWERLICH FALLEN'

OHG. *ga-urdriozōn* 'tribulare' from *urdrioz* 'injuria': OE. *prūtian* 'swell,' ON. *prūtenn* 'geschwollen, crowded, packed': MG. *drōz*, OHG. *drōzan* 'mit beschwerde ziehen,' ON. *praut* 'beschwerde, mühsal,' OE. *prēat* 'crowd, troop; violence; threat,' *prēatian* 'bedrängen,' *prēatnian* 'force': MHG. *verdrozzen* 'verdriesslich machen,' *druz* 'beschwerde.'

CLASS III

144. OHG. *belgan* 'AUFGEBRACHT SEIN, ZORNIG SEIN ÜBER'

OHG. *irbelgen*, MHG. *erbelgen* 'erzürnen, kränken,' OHG. *balg* 'balg, haut': MHG. *erbolgen* 'sich erheben, zürnen,' OHG. *bulgā*, MHG. *bulge* 'ranzen, aufgeschwollene woge.'

145. OHG. *bellan* 'BELLEN'.

OHG. *pullōn*, MHG. *büllen*, *bülken* 'heulen, brüllen, brausen.'

146. GOTH. *baírgan* 'BERGEN, BEWAHREN'

OHG. *heribergōn* 'herbergen': OHG. *borgēn*, MHG. *borgen* 'sich wovor hüten, worauf acht haben, schonen, borgen,' MHG. *verbürgen*, *-burgen* 'verbürgen, *verburgern* 'zu einer anderen herrschaft ziehen.'

147. GOTH. *bindan* 'BINDEN'

Goth. *gabinda* 'band,' OHG. *binta* 'binde': *bant* 'band,' *brustpendelōn* 'mit der brustbinde umgürten,' MHG. *banden*, *benden* 'in bande legen,' *bandeln* zu *bande* 'binde, streifen': Goth. *andbundnan* 'gelöst werden,' MHG. *verbunden* 'verbinden mit.'

148. OE. *bregdan* 'FLECHTEN,' OHG. *brettan* 'ZIEHEN, ZÜCKEN, WEBEN, SPANNEN'

OHG. *brutten*, MHG. *brutten* 'erschrecken.'

149. OHG. *brestan* 'BRECHEN, BERSTEN'

OHG. *prastōn*, MHG. *brasten*, *brasseln*, *brasteln*, *bratzlen* 'prasseln,' OE. *brastlian* 'crackle, rattle.'

150. MHG. *brimmen* 'BRUMMEN, BRÜLLEN'

MHG. *brimmen*, MLG. *brimmen*: MLG. *brammen*: MHG. *brummen*, MLG. *brummen* 'brummen,' MHG. *brummieren* 'posaunen schallen lassen.' Cf. OHG. *breman* st. 'brummen.'

151. GOTH. *brinnan* 'BRENNEN'

Goth. *gabrannjan* 'verbrennen,' MHG. *brennen*, *bernen* 'brennen': MG. *brunnen*, *burnen* for *brennen*, MHG. *brunnen* 'hervorquellen, harnen,' *brunzen* 'harnen,' *prünzeln* 'brandig riechen.'

152. GOTH. *briggan* 'BRINGEN'

OE. *brengan*, OS. *brengian*, MG. *brengen* 'bringen': Goth. *briggan*, OHG. *bringan*, MHG. *bringen*, etc. have a weak pret. in ablaut *brāhta*, *brāhte* (**branhta*).

153. OHG. *bitelban* 'BEGRABEN'

MHG. *dalpen* 'graben.'

154. GOTH. *gadars* PRET. PRES. 'ICH WAGE'

OHG. *gi-tar:* pl. *giturrun*, MHG. *tar:* plur. *turren*, Goth. *ga-daursan* 'wagen,' OHG. *kiturran*, MHG. *geturren* 'wagen,' OHG. *kitursteōn* 'usurpare,' Goth. *gadaursta* pret., OHG. *gitorsta*, MHG. *torste.*

155. MHG. *dimpfen* 'DAMPFEN, RAUCHEN'

MHG. *dampf*, OHG. *demphan*, MHG. *dempfen* 'dampf verursachen': MHG. *dumpfen*, *dümpfen* 'flamme unterdrücken.'

156. **dingwan*, OSW. *diunger* 3 SING. PRES. 'SCHLÄGT'

MHG. *tingelen* 'klopfen, hämmern': ON. *dengia*, MHG. *-tengen* 'schlagen,' MHG. *tengelen* 'dengeln, klopfen,' OHG. *tangol* 'hammer,' MHG. *tangel* 'dengelstock,' ON. *dengja* 'hammer.' Cf. E. *ding*, ME. *dingen* st. v.

157. GOTH. *drigkan* 'TRINKEN'

Goth. *dragkjan*, MHG. *trenken* 'tränken, *tranc:* Goth. *afdrugkja* 'trunkenbold, OHG. *trunkanēn* 'trunken werden.'

158. MHG. *verzen* 'BOMBISARE'

MHG. *varzen* 'pedere,' *varz* 'furz': *vurzen*, *vorzen* 'bombisare,' *vurz* 'bombus.' Cf. ON. *freta*, *fretr*, *frata* 'farzen,' etc.

159. GOTH. *finþan* 'FINDEN, ERFAHREN'

OHG. *fandōn* 'examinare,' MHG. *vanden* 'besuchen,' *venden* 'einernten,' *vanten* 'auffinden,' NHG. *fahnden:* OHG. *funden*, OS. *fundon*, OE. *fundjan* 'streben, gehen,' MHG. *vündeln* 'forschend finden.'

160. GOTH. *fra-gildan* 'VERGELTEN, ERSTATTEN'

Goth. *gilstr* 'steuer,' OHG. *gelt* 'zahlung': OHG. *ingaltan*, MHG. *engelten* 'entgelten lassen, strafen': *gültære* 'gläubiger,' *gülten* 'eine zahlung oder abgabe leisten.'

161. OHG. *gellan* 'LAUT TÖNEN, SCHREIEN'

MHG. *gelm* 'schall,' *gelmen* 'laut tönen, schreien,' *gelsen* 'gellen, schreien': MHG. *ergellen* 'durch schall erschüttern,' *ergelsen* 'aufschreien,' OHG. *gelzōn*, MHG. *gelzen* 'aufschreien,' ON. *gelta* 'bellen, kläffen,' OHG. *galzā* 'wohl das aufschreiende tier'

(Schade A. W.): MHG. *goln* 'laut singen, johlen,' *golenzen* intens. Cf. OHG. *galan* st. and Goth. *gōljan*, No. 301.

162. Goth. *-gairdan* '-gürten'

OHG. *gart* 'kreis': *gurten*, MHG. *gürten* 'gürten,' OHG. *gurtil*, MHG. *gürtel* 'gürtel.'

163. OE. *georran* 'creak, chatter'

MHG. *garren* 'pfeifen, zwitschern,' MLG. *garren* 'grunzen,' ON. *gersta*, *gesta* 'aufreizen, annoy': MHG. *gurren* 'gurren, girren.' Cf. No. 583 for *girren*, etc.

164. MHG. *glimmen* 'glühen'

MHG. *glim* 'funke,' *glimen* 'glühen,' *glimmern* 'glühen,' *glimsen* 'glühen, glimmen': *glamme* 'glut,' NHG. Bav. *glisglammern* 'glitzern,' MHG. *erglemmen* 'anfangen zu glimmen': NHG. dial. *glumsen* 'unter der asche glimmen.' Cf. MHG. *glins* 'glanz,' *glimsen*, etc.

165. MHG. *glinzen* 'glänzen'

OHG. *glanz* 'hell, glänzend,' OHG., MHG. *glenzen* 'glänzend machen,' ME. *glenten* 'glitter.' Cf. *glinsen* 'glimmen.'

166. MHG. *grellen* 'laut vor zorn schreien'

MHG. *vergrellen* 'zur wut aufreizen': *grüllen* 'höhnen, spotten,' *grulz* 'lärm, aufruhr,' *grolzer* 'der rülpst, grollend lärmt,' *grölzen* 'ructare.'

167. MHG. *grimmen* 'vor zorn oder schmerz wüten, tobend lärmen'

OHG. *krimmisōn* 'rasen,' *gruscrimmon*, MHG. *grisgrimmen* 'vor unmut oder grimm mit den zähnen knirschen, knurren, brummen': OHG. *gram* 'zornig,' Goth. *gramjan* 'erzürnen,' OHG., MHG. *gremen*, OHG. *-cramōn*, MHG. *-gramen* (*gris-*, *grus-*) 'vor unmut mit den zähnen knirschen': MHG. *grummen* 'knurren, brummen,' *grummunge* 'fremitus.'

168. OE. *grindan* 'grind, sharpen'

MHG. *grind* 'kies, sand,' *grinden* 'grindig werden,' OHG. *grint* 'grind, schorf': ON. *granda* 'schaden': OHG. *grunt* 'tiefe, schlucht, grund.'

169. MHG. *grinnen* 'ZÄHNE FLETSCHEND KNURREN, KNIRSCHEN'

OHG. *grennen*, MHG. *grannen*, *grennen* 'angrinsen,' OHG. *granōn*, MHG. *granen* 'grunzen, weinen,' OE. *grennian* 'greinen, grinsen,' ON. *grenja* 'heulen, brüllen': OE. *grunian* 'grunzen,' OHG. *grunzjan*, MHG. *grunzen* intens. of *grinnen*, E. *grunt*.

170. OHG. *hellan* 'ERTÖNEN, HALLEN'

OHG. *halōn*, MHG. *haln*, OS. *halon*, E. *hale* 'berufen, holen, einladen': OHG. *holōn*, MHG. *holn* 'berufen, holen, einladen.'

171. OHG. *hinkan* 'HINKEN'

MHG. *hanken* 'hinken, lahmen.' Cf. *hingeln* 'lahmen, hinken.'

172. GOTH. *frahinþan* 'GEFANGEN NEHMEN'

Goth. *handus* 'hand,' OHG. *drittehantōn* 'tertiare,' *hantalōn*, MHG. *handeln* 'mit der hand fassen, berühren,' MHG. *be-henden* 'mit den händen berühren': Goth. *hunþs* 'gefangenshaft,' OHG. *herihunda* 'kriegsbeute,' *verhunden* 'fangen.'

173. OHG. *hlimman* 'KNURREN, BRUMMEN, KNIRSCHEN'

OHG. *hlim* 'torrens': Goth. *hlamma* 'fall, fallstrick,' ON. *hlam* 'ein schwerer schall,' *hlamma* 'einen schwachen schall von sich geben,' OHG. *hlamōn* 'rauschen, brausen,' ON. *hlamman* 'krach': ON. *hlymia* 'toben,' *hlymr* 'getöse.'

174. OHG. *hrespan* 'RUPFEN, RAFFEN'

OHG. *raspōn*, MHG. *raspen* 'zusammenraffen.' Cf. MHG. *rispe* 'gezweig,' *rispeln* 'kräuseln,' OHG. *ruspan* 'starren (vom haare).'

175. OHG. *hrimfan* 'KRÜMMEN, RÜMPFEN, RUNZELN'

MHG. *rimph* 'verziehen des mundes,' *rimpfen* 'ritzen, krallen': MHG. *ramph* 'krampf': *rumph* 'gekrümmt, gebogen,' E. *rumple* 'runzeln; runzel.'

176. MHG. (*h*)*welben* 'SICH WÖLBEN'

Goth. *hwilftri* 'sarg': OS. *bi-hwelƀian* 'mit wölbung bedecken,' MHG. *welben* 'wölben,' ON. *huelfa* 'wölben,' OHG. *walbēn* 'volubilem esse,' *walbo* 'gewölbter gegenstand': MHG. *wolbe* 'teil des daches,' ON. *holfa* 'gewölbt sein.'

177. Goth. *hwairban* 'wandeln'

Goth. *hwarbōn* 'wandeln, umhergehen,' OHG. *warbōn* 'wandeln, *pi-hwarbjan* 'devertere,' MHG. *werben* 'drehen,' OHG. *warbalōn* sich im kreise drehen,' *warba* 'drehung': MHG. *würbeln* 'sich drehen,' *worbele* 'achse,' *zerworben* 'gras auseinander werfen.'

178 OHG. *an* 'ich gönne' pret. pres.

Goth. *ansts* 'gunst,' OMHG. *enstōn* 'lieb werden': OHG. *unnan* 'gönnen,' *unst* 'gunst.'

179. OHG. *kerran* 'schreien, brüllen, knarren'

MHG. *kirsen* 'knirschen': *kerren* 'anfeinden,' *karren* 'schreien, brüllen, knarren': MLG. *kurren*, ON. *kurra* 'knurren.'

180. Goth. *kann* pret. pres. 'ich weiss, kenne'

Goth. *ga-kannjan*, OHG. *kennan* 'bekannt machen,' MHG. *kennen* 'kennen': Goth. *kunnan* pret. pres., OHG. *kunnan*, MHG. *künnen*, *kunnen* 'kennen, wissen,' Goth. *gakunnan* 'kenntnis haben, erkennen,' OE. *cunnian* 'erforschen, versuchen,' OHG. *irchunnēn* 'kennen, lernen,' Goth. *-kunþjan* in *ga-swikunþjan* 'offenbar, bekannt machen,' OHG. *kunden*, etc. Cf. OE., No. 318.

181. OE. *climban* 'klimmern, klettern'

MHG. *klamben* 'fest zusammenfügen,' ON. *klambra* 'zwängen, einschliessen,' OHG. *chlemman*, MHG. *klemmen* 'klemmen, kneipen,' *klemberen* 'verklammern,' E. *clamber* 'klettern.'

182. MHG. *klimpfen* 'zusammenziehen, fest zusammendrücken'

ON. *kleppr* 'klotz, klumpen,' Sw. *klimp* 'klümpchen, kloss': MHG. *klampfer* 'klammer,' *klampfern* 'fest zusammenfügen,' E. *clamp: clump*, MG. *klümpen* (LG.) 'zusammenschrumpfen,' MHG. *erklumpfen* 'zusammenfahren, schaudern.'

183. OHG. *klingan* 'klingen, tönen'

OHG. *clingilōn*, MHG. *klingeln*, OHG. *klingisōn* 'klingeln, rauschen': MHG. *klengen*, *klengeln* 'klingeln, klingen machen,' *klangeln* 'klingeln': MHG. *klunc*(*-ges*) klang. Cf. E. *clink*, *clank*, *clinkum-clankum* and MHG. *klinken* st. below.

184. OE. *clingan* 'SHRINK, WITHER'

ME. *clengen* fact. of *clingan*, ON. *klengiask* 'sich anklammern,' Sw. *klänga* 'klettern,' *klänge* 'wickelranke': *klunga*, OHG. *klunga* 'klumpen, knäuel,' MHG. *klungeln* 'zusammenrollen, klumpen.'

185. MHG. *klinken* 'KLINGEN'

MHG. *klenken* 'klingen machen,' *klanc*(*-kes*) 'klang.'

186. MHG. *er-knellen* 'ERSCHALLEN'

MHG. *knellen* 'mit einem knall zerplatzen,' Du. *knallen* 'to give loud report,' NHG. *knall*, *knallen:* MHG. *knüllen* 'schlagen,' OE. *cnyllan*, *cnyllsan* 'knell, sound a bell' (whence E. *knell*, *knoll*), Icel. *knylla* 'to beat with a blunt weapon.'

187. OHG. *krimman* 'DRÜCKEN, KRATZEN, DIE KLAUEN KRÜMMEN'

MHG. *kram*, *kramme* 'krampf,' *krammen* 'mit den klauen packen': *krumben*, *krummen* 'krumm sein,' OHG. *chrumben*, MHG. *krümben*, *krümmen* 'krumm machen.'

188. OHG. *krimpfan* 'SICH KRÜMMEN, KRAMPFHAFT ZUSAMMENZIEHEN'

OHG. *krampf* 'haken; gekrümmt,' E. *cramp*, MHG. *verkrempfen* 'krampfhaft zusammenziehen: Sw. *krympa* 'krimpen,' E. *crumple*, OE. *crump* 'crooked,' *crympan* 'curl,' E. *crimp*, *crimple.*

189. OE. *cringan* 'FALL, PERISH'

E. *cringe* 'zusammenziehen, krümmen; sich demütig beugen, schmiegen,' MHG. *krinc* 'kreis, ring,' *kringel* 'kreis, bretzel,' Norse *kringja* 'umgeben,' NHG. *kringeln:* MHG. *kranc* 'kreis, umkreis,' *krange* 'bedrängnis,' *krangel* 'kreis,' *krangeln* 'irren, hindern?,' ON. *krangr* 'schwächlich,' *kranga* 'schwanken, taumeln,' Sw. *kränga* 'wenden,' Norw. *krangle* 'zanken.'

190. OE. *crincan* 'NIEDERSINKEN, NACHGEBEN'

MLG. *krink* 'ring, kreis,' E. *crinkle* 'biegung': *crank* 'krümmung,' *crankle* 'sich schlängeln,' MHG. *kranc* 'schmal, schlank, schwach,' *kranken* 'krank sein, werden,' *krenken* 'krank machen,'

krenkern 'schwächer machen,' OHG. *krankolōn* 'straucheln': NE. *crunkle* 'crumple.'

191. OHG. *lescan* 'ZU LEUCHTEN ODER BRENNEN AUFHÖREN'

OHG. *lescan*, MHG. *leschen* 'auslöschen.'

192. OHG. *limphan* 'ANGEMESSEN SEIN, VON STATTEN GEHEN'

OHG. *galimphlīh* 'angemessen,' MHG. *gelimpf* 'angemessenes benehmen,' *gelimpfen* 'angemessen machen, fügen': MHG. *lampen* 'welk niederhängen,' *lempe* 'stück fleisch': *gilumphida* 'angemessene gelegenheit.'

193. OE. *meltan* 'MELT'

OHG. *milzi* 'milz': Goth. *gamalteins* 'auflösung,' OHG. *malz* 'hinschmelzend; malz,' MHG. *malzen*, *melzen* 'mälzen, zu malz dörren,' ON. *melta* 'verdauen,' Icel. *maltr* 'verfault, verdorben': late MHG. *mulzer* 'mälzer,' *mulzen* 'mälzen.' The *u*-forms are late analogical ones.

194. OHG. *ginindan* 'MUT ZU ETWAS HABEN'

OHG. *nendan*, MHG. *nenden* 'wagen,' ON. *nenna* 'sich an etwas machen,' OS. *nāthian* 'wagen,' Goth. *anananþjan* 'sich erkühnen.'

195. Goth. *rinnan* 'RENNEN, LAUFEN'

Goth. *rinnō* 'giessbach,' OHG. *rinna* 'wasserleitung': Goth. *ur-rannjan* 'aufgehen lassen,' OHG. *rennan* 'rasch laufen machen,' MHG. *rennen* 'gerinnen machen,' OHG. *rennunga* 'lauf, cursus': Goth. *runs* 'lauf,' OHG. *runs* 'lauf des wassers.'

196. Goth. *siggwan* 'SINGEN, VORLESEN'

MHG. *singœre*, *singer* 'sänger': OHG. *liebsangōn* 'ein freudenlied anstimmen,' MHG. *sangen*,' 'singen,' OHG. *sengan* (**sangjan* 'singen machen'), MHG. *sengen* 'machen dass etwas einen singenden knisternden ton von sich gibt; sengen, versengen, anbrennen,' MHG. *sengeln* 'singend sprechen': *sungeln*, *sunkeln* 'angesengt knistern,' *besungen* 'ansengen.' Cf. Grimm, *Gr.*, II, p. 34, *sünkeln*, *sinkeln*, *besunget.*

197. Goth. *siggan* 'SINKEN'

MHG. *sinkel* 'vertiefung,' Goth. *saggjan* 'versenken,' ON. *søkkua*, OE. *sencan*, OHG. *senkan*, NHG. *senken* 'senken.'

198. OHG. *sinnan* 'EINE RICHTUNG NEHMEN, WANDERN'

Goth. *sinþs* 'mal; ursp. gang, weg,' OHG. *sindōn*, MHG. *sinden*, OS. *sīthon* 'reisen, sich kümmern um,' MHG. *sinnen* 'sinn oder verstand verleihen, sinnen, denken,' *besinnigen* 'zur vernunft bringen': Goth. *sandjan*, OHG. *sentan* 'senden.'

199. OHG. *scellan* 'SCHALLEN, TÖNEN'

OHG. *scella* 'schelle': *scellan* 'zerschellen,' MHG. *schellen* 'ertönen lassen,' *verschellen* 'betäuben, verschreien,' *verschelzen* intens.

200. OE. *sceorpan* 'SCHRAPPEN'

MHG. *scharf; scherpfen* 'scharf machen': OHG. *scurfen*, MHG. *schürfen* 'aufschneiden.' Cf. *scherbe*, OHG. *scarbōn* 'zerschneiden' etc., OHG. *screvōn* 'einschneiden,' MHG. *schrove* 'felsklippe.' Cf. *screpan*, No. 258.

201. OHG. *skerran* 'SCHARREN, KRATZEN, SCHABEN'

OHG. *skerra* 'scharreisen,' MHG. *scharren* 'scharren, kratzen': OHG. *scorrēn*, MHG. *schorren* 'hervorragen,' MHG. *schorn* 'zusammenscharren, stossen, schüren,' *schor* 'schaufel, schroffer fels,' Goth. *winþi-skaurō* 'worfschaufel,' MHG. *schürn* 'antreiben, reizen.' Cf. OHG. *sceran*, No. 257.

202. MHG. *schrecken* 'AUFFAHREN'

OHG. *screcchōn*, MHG. *schrecken* 'springen, hüpfen,' OHG. *hewiscrekko* 'heuschrecke': *screcken*, MHG. *schrecken* 'aufspringen machen, erschrecken.' Cf. ON. *skrǣkr* 'schrei,' *skrǣkia* 'schreien.'

203. ON. *sleppa* 'ENTSCHLÜPFEN'

NHG. *schlimpe* 'catch': MHG. *slampen* 'schlaff herabhängen,' *slempen* 'schleppen, schleifen,' NHG. *schlamp*, *schlempe* 'sloppy food': *schlumpe* 'draggle-tailed person,' *schlumpen*, *schlumpern* 'to draggle (in mud, etc.),' MHG. *slump* (MG.) 'schlumpig,' E. *slump*, *slumpy*. Cf. *slēpan*, No. 321.

204. GOTH. *fraslindan* 'VERSCHLINGEN'

Early Du. *slinderen* 'gleiten, ausschlüpfen,' MHG. *slint* 'schlund, schlinger,' *slindern* (LG.) 'serpere': early L. Rhen. *slenden* 'gleiten,' LG. *slendern* 'schlendern': MHG. *sluntizen*,'

'sob, hiccough,' MHG. *slunt* 'schlund,' NHG. *schlunzen*. Cf. Sw. *slinta* 'gleiten,' E. *slant*.

205. OE. *slincan* 'CREEP, SLINK'

MHG. *slenken*, *slenkern* 'schwingen, schleudern,' *slanc* 'mager': Du. *slunk* 'speiseröhre,' *slunkern* 'schlenkern,' Dan. *slunken* 'schlaff, schlottrig.'

206. OSw. *slinta* 'GLEITEN'

MHG. *slenzic* 'träge, müssig,' NHG. *schlenzen* 'müssig gehen': *schlunzen* 'nachlässig einhergehen.'

207. OHG. *smelzan* 'SCHMELZEN'

OHG. *smelzan*, MHG. *smelzen* 'schmelzen,' OHG. *smalz* 'fett zum kochen': OS. *smultro* 'auf sanfte weise,' OE. *smylte* 'mild, tranquil,' OSw. *smoltna* 'ruhig werden.'

208. OHG. *smerzan* 'SCHMERZEN'

OHG. *smerza* 'schmerz,' MHG. *smerzigen* 'in schmerz versetzen': MHG. *smerzen* 'in schmerz verwandeln': *smurzen* same as *smerzen*. Cf. *smirzen*, *smurzen*, No. 606.

209. OHG. *snerfan* 'ZUSAMMENZIEHEN, VERZIEHEN'

Goth. *atsnarpjan* 'benagen?,' ON. *snarpr* 'scharf, hart,' NHG. Bav. *schnarfen*: *schnurfen*, *schnurfeln* 'sich einziehen, schrumpfen.'

210. ON. *snerta* 'BERÜHREN'

MHG. *snarzen* 'schnarren': Dan. *snurten* 'reizbar, ärgerlich,' ME. *snorte* 'snort.

211. OE. *speornan* 'SPURN'

OHG. *-spirnen* in *firspirnen* 'anstossen, offendere,' *spirneda* 'scandalum': *spornōn*, MHG. *spornen* 'spornen,' OHG. *spurnen*, MHG. *spürnen* 'mit füssen treten,' OHG. *spurnida* 'scandalum, offensio.' Cf. OHG. *spurilōn*, *spurjan*, MHG. *spüren* 'investigare, spur verfolgen,' OHG. *sporōn*, MHG. *sporen* 'spornen.' (**sper*—'mit den füssen treten').

212. OHG. *spaltan* REDUP. 'SPALTEN'

Goth. *spilda* 'schreibtafel,' MHG. *spelte* 'abgespaltenes holzstück,' OE. *speld* 'splinter, torch,' *spildan*, ON. *spilla* 'waste,

destroy,' MHG. *zwi-spilden* 'in zwei teilen,' MLG. *spilden* 'aufbrauchen, verschwenden': MHG. *zerspelten* wk. 'zerspalten machen.'

213. GOTH. *spinnan* 'SPINNEN'

OHG. *spinnila*, MHG. *spinnele* 'spindel,' MHG. *spinneln* 'mit spinneln versehen': OHG. *spanna* 'breite der ausgestreckten hand.' Cf. OHG. *spannan* redup. 'spannen, ausbreiten': MHG. *gespunst* 'gespinst, spinnen.'

214. OHG. *springen* 'SPRINGEN'

MHG. *urspringen* 'entpriessen, quellen,' OHG. *spring*, *urspring*, E. *spring* 'quelle,' MHG. *springer* 'springer': OHG. *sprengan*,' MHG. *sprengen* 'sprengen,' OHG. *sprangōn* 'springen': *sprung* 'sprung,' *sprungel* 'springend,' *sprungezen* 'vor freude springen,' MHG. *ursprunc*, *ursprungen* = *urspring*, *-springen*. Cf. the following.

215. ON. *spretta* 'SPRINGEN'

MHG. *sprinz* 'das aufspringen,' late MHG. *sprinzeln* 'viel umherspringen,' E. *sprint:* ON. *spretta* 'lösen, los machen,' MHG. *spranz* 'aufspriessen; spalt,' *sprenzen* 'sprengen, spritzen,' *spranzelieren* 'einherstolzieren.'

216. OSw. *stiælpa* 'UMFALLEN'

OSw. *stiælpa* (**stalpjan*) 'umwälzen,' ON. *stelpa* 'umstürzen,' MHG. *stalpen* 'stampfen' (from LG.), MDu. *stalpen* 'stossen, stampfen': MLG. *stulpen* 'umstürzen,' NHG. *stolpern*.

217. OHG. *sterban* 'STERBEN'

ON. *stjarfe* 'starrkrampf': OHG. *irsterben*, MHG. *ersterben* 'necare,' ON. *starfa* 'sich abmühen,' ON. *starf* 'arbeit, mühe.'

218. **sterkan* ON. PP. *storkenn* 'ERSTARRT'

OHG. *ki-starkan*, MHG. *sterken* 'stark machen,' OHG. *gestarkēn*, MHG. *starken* 'stark sein, werden': Goth. *gastaurknan*, OHG. *storchanēn* 'erstarren,' ON. *styrkja* 'stärken,' *storkna* 'erstarren.' Cf. OHG. *strackēn* 'ausgedehnt sein,' etc.

219. MHG. *sterzen* 'sich rasch bewegen, umherschweifen, steif emporragen'

OHG. *sterz* 'schwanz,' MHG. *sterz* 'stiel': MHG. *starzen* 'sich rasch bewegen, steif aufrichten,' OE. *steartlian* 'aufspringen': OHG. *pisturzen*, MHG. *bestürzen* 'umwenden,' *sturz* 'sturz.'

220. ON. *stinga* 'stechen'

OHG. *stingil* 'stengel': *stanga* 'stange,' *stengel* dimin., MHG. *stengen* 'antreiben': OHG. *stung* 'punctum,' *stungan*, *stungēn*, *stungōn*, MHG. *stungen* 'stechen, stimulare.'

221. Goth. *stiggan* 'stossen'

OHG. *stinchil* 'odorus,' MHG. *stinken* 'gestank,' Goth. *gastaggjan* 'anstossen,' OHG. *stenchan*, MHG. *stenken* 'geruch, wohlgeruch machen,' from *stanc* 'duft': Goth. *bistugg* 'anstoss,' OHG. *stunk* 'olfactus.'

222. OHG. *swellan* 'anschwellen'

OHG. *swil* 'schwiele,' *swillan*, MHG. *swiln* 'schwielig werden': OHG. *piswellan* 'stauen, stemmen,' MHG. *swellen* 'anschwellen machen, stauen,' Goth. *ufswalleins* 'das aufgeschwollen sein; hochmut': MHG. *geswulst* 'geschwulst.'

223. OHG. *swimman* 'schwimmen'

MHG. *swimmer:* OHG. *swam* 'schwamm,' MHG. *swamen*, *swemmen* 'schwimmen machen,' *swam* 'überschwemmung': MG. *swummen*, *swommen* 'schwimmen,' MHG. *swummer* 'schwimmer.'

224. OHG. *swintan* 'schwinden'

OHG. *swintilōn*, MHG. *swindeln* 'schwindeln,' *swinde* 'schwindsucht': OHG. *ferswenden*, MHG. *verswenden* 'verschwinden machen' (*swentan*, *swenden*), MHG. *swant* 'das aushauen des waldes,' *swende* 'das land dadurch (*swant*) gewonnen.' Cf. OHG. *swīnan* st. 'schwinden,' No. 65.

225. OHG. *swingan* 'schwingen'

Goth. *afswaggwjan* 'schwankend machen,' OE. *swengan*, E. *swinge* 'beat soundly, punish,' MHG. *swanger* 'schwankend, schwanger,' *swangern* 'schwanger sein,' ON. *suangr* 'schlank,

dünn,' MHG. *swengeln* 'schwingen,' *swengern* 'schwängern': *swunc* (*swunges*) 'schwung.' Cf. the following.

226. OE. *swincan* 'LABOR, BE IN PAIN'

OE. *geswinc* 'toil, effort': MHG. *swanc* 'biegsam, dünn, schlank,' OHG. *swank* 'schwung, hieb,' *swenken* 'schwenken, schlendern; schweifen, schweben, sich schlingen,' MHG. *swanken* 'schwanken,' *swanzen* (**swankezen*) 'hin u. her schwanken,' *swenzen*, *swenzeln* 'schwenken,' *swanz* 'schwanz.' Cf. MHG. *swach* 'niedrig, schwach,' Goth. *siuks* 'krank, schwach,' etc., No. 119.

227. MHG. *zinden* 'BRENNEN, GLÜHEN'

Goth. *tandjan* 'anzünden,' OHG. *zantaro*, MHG. *zander* 'glühende kohle,' ON. *tandre* 'feuer': Goth. *intundnan* 'brennen, entzündet werden,' OHG. *zundēn*, MHG. *zunden*, *zünden* 'in brand sein, ein licht anzünden,' OHG. *zuntan* 'in brand setzen,' *zuntara*, MHG. *zunder* 'zunder,' OHG. *zuntil* 'anzünder.'

228. GOTH. *anatrimpan* 'HERANTRETEN, BEDRÄNGEN'

MHG. *trampeln* intens. 'derb auftretend sich bewegen': *trumpfen* 'laufen, trollen.' Cf. without nasal Du. *trappen*, OE. *treppan* 'tread.'

229. OHG. *trinnan* 'DAVON GEHEN, SICH ABSONDERN'

OHG. *intrennjan* 'auftrennen, MHG. *trennen* 'trennen': OHG. *abetrunne* 'sich sondernd.'

230. MHG. *verderben* 'ZU NICHTE WERDEN, ZU SCHADEN KOMMEN'

Goth. *þarba* 'mangel,' *ga-þarban*, OHG. *darbēn*, MHG. *darben* 'entbehren, sich enthalten,' *derben* 'in verderben bringen,' Goth. *þarbs* 'bedürftig, nötig': *þaurban* 'bedürfen.' Cf. the following.

231. **þerfan*, GOTH. *þarf* 'ICH BEDARF'

OHG. *durfan*, MHG. *dürfen* 'nötig haben, brauchen,' Goth. *þaurfts*, MHG. *durft* 'nötig.'

232. GOTH. *gaþairsan* 'VERDORREN'

OHG. *derren*, OMHG. *darren*, ON. *þerra* 'dörren': Goth. *ga-þaursnan* 'verdorren,' *þaursjan*, OHG. *dursten*, MHG. *dürsten*

'dürsten,' Goth. *paurstei*, OHG. *durst* 'durst,' Goth. *paursus*, OHG. *durri* 'dürr,' OHG. *dorrēn*, MHG. *dorren* 'dürr werden.'

233. **þinhan*, OS. pp. *githungan* 'TÜCHTIG'

ON. *þing*, OHG. *ding* 'volksversammlung, *dingjan* 'hoffen, glauben, zuversicht haben,' *dingōn* 'gericht halten,' MHG. *dingen* 'hoffen,' etc.; 'gericht halten': OS. *thengian* 'vollenden.' Cf. Goth. *þeihs* 'zeit,' *þeihan* (**þinhan*) 'gedeihen.'

234. Goth. *atþinsan* 'HERANZIEHEN, ZIEHEN'

OHG. *dansōn*, MHG. *dansen* 'ziehen, dehnen.' Cf. Goth. *ufþanjan*, OHG. *dennen* 'dehnen,' OHG. *donēn*, MHG. *donen* 'sich spannen.'

235. OHG. *dringan* 'SICH DRÄNGEN, ANDRINGEN'

OHG. *drangōn*, MHG. *drangen*, *drengen* 'drängen,' OHG. *gidrengi* 'gedränge.'

236. OHG. *dwingan* 'DRÜCKEN, PRESSEN, DRÄNGEN'

MHG. *twingern* 'wozu nötigen,' MHG. *twinc* 'das zwingende': OHG. *dwengen*, MHG. *twengen* 'drücken, zwängen,' *twanc* 'zwang.' Cf. MHG. *diuhen* (**pūhjan*<**punhjan*) 'drücken, schieben.'

237. MHG. *welgen* 'WÄLZEN, ROLLEN'

OHG. *walgōn*, MHG. *walgen* 'sich wälzen,' *walgern*, NHG. *walgern* 'rollend wälzen,' MHG. *welgeln* 'wälzen': *wulgern*, *wolgern* 'nauseare; rollend wälzen,' NHG. *wulger* 'cylinderförmig gemachtes.' Cf. OHG. *walkan* redup. 'walken' and the following.

238. OHG. *wēllan* 'WÄLZEN, ROLLEN'

OHG. *wella*, MHG. *welle* 'welle,' OHG. *wellōn* 'wellen schlagen,' MHG. *wellegen* 'wogen schlagen': *wellen*, *waln* 'rollen, wälzen': OHG. *wullōn*, MHG. *wüllen* 'ekel empfinden' (cf. *wulgern* above). Cf. OHG. *wallan* redup. 'wallen,' Goth. *wulan* 'sieden.'

239. ON. *velta* 'SICH WÄLZEN, ROLLEN'

OHG. *walzan*, MHG. *welzen* 'rollen, wälzen,' Goth. *uswaltjan*, OHG. *walzōn* 'sich wälzen,' *walza* 'walze,' MHG. *welzeln*, *welzern* 'rollen.' Cf. OHG. *walzan* redup. 'walzen.'

240. GOTH. *wilwan* 'RAUBEN'

Goth. *wilwa* 'räuber': *afwalwjan* 'abwälzen,' *walwisōn* 'sich wälzen': *wulwa* 'raub.'

241. MHG. *ir-wergen* 'ERWÜRGEN,' PP. *ir-worgen*

MHG. *wergen* 'würgen machen, reissen': OHG. *wurgan*, MHG. *wurgen*, *würgen* 'ersticken,' OS. *wurgil* 'strick zum erwürgen.'

242. GOTH. *wairpan* 'WERFEN'

OHG. *werfōn* 'werfen, schleudern': MHG. *warfen* 'kette eines gewebes machen,' E. *warp*, OHG. *warf* 'kette eines gewebes': MHG. *worfen* 'worfeln,' *wurf*, *würfeln*, *würfel*.

243. OHG. *werran* 'IN VERWIRRUNG BRINGEN'

MHG. *verwirren* 'sich verwickeln': *verwerren* 'in unordnung bringen,' *verwerzeln* 'verwirren': *ver-würren* 'sich verwickeln.'

244. GOTH. *wairþan* 'WERDEN'

Goth. *andawairþs* 'gegenwärtig,' OHG. *widarwertōn* 'obviare, fraudare': Goth. *frawardjan* 'verderben, entstellen,' OHG. *widarwartōn* 'obviare,' etc., *wartjan*, MHG. *werten* 'verderben, beschädigen,' *antwart: antwurt* 'gegenwart,' *antwürten* 'übergeben, überantworten,' not *antwürten* 'to answer,' although the two forms may have become confused.

245. GOTH. *bi-windan* 'UMWINDEN, EINWICKELN'

MHG. *winde* 'winde,' *windeln* 'in windeln einhüllen': Goth. *wandjan*, OHG. *wentan*, MHG. *wenden* 'wenden, umwenden,' OHG. *wantōn* 'sich wandeln, wechseln,' MHG. *wanden* 'kleiden,' *anwanden* 'angrenzen,' *anwande* 'grenzstreifen wo der pflug umwendet.' Cf. OHG. *wīlwandōn* 'alternare,' *wantalōn*, MHG. *wandeln*, *wandern*.

246. MHG. *winken* 'WANKEN, SEITWÄRTS BEWEGEN' (PRET. *wanc*)

MHG. *winken* wk. also, *ver-winkeln* 'in den winkel stecken,' OHG. *winkil*, MHG. *winkel* 'winkel, ecke': OHG. *wankōn*, MHG. *wanken* 'ausweichen, wanken,' OHG. *wenkan*, MHG. *wenken*

'weichen, wanken,' *wanc* 'bewegung zur seite,' OHG. *wanchilin*, MHG. *wankeln* 'wackeln.'

247. Goth. *winnan* 'leiden'

Goth. *winna* 'leiden,' OHG. *wini* 'freund': Goth. *wēns* 'hoffnung,' *wēnjan* 'erwarten, hoffen,' OHG. *wānjan*, MHG. *wænen* 'vermuten, meinen, glauben, hoffen': OHG. *wunnia* 'wonne, wiese,' *wunna* 'freude, lust,' Goth. *unwunands* 'in angst befindlich,' MHG. *wünnen* 'in wonne sein,' OHG. *wunscan*, MHG. *wünschen*. Cf. also OHG. *wenjan*, MHG. *wenen* 'gewöhnen,' OHG. *wonēn*, *wonōn* 'bleiben, wohnen,' ON. *una* 'zufrieden sein,' Goth. *winja* 'weide, futter,' OHG. *winne* 'weide.'

Note.—These forms do not all belong to Class III, but may be put together here and referred to the stem '*wen-*.'

248. OHG. (*w*)*ringan* 'drückend winden, ringen'

MHG. *rangen* 'ringen,' E. *wrangle, wrong:* Goth. *wruggō* 'schlinge.'

CLASS IV

249. Goth. *bairan* 'tragen'

OHG. *birigōn* 'fruchtbar machen' zu *birig* 'fruchtbar': Goth. *barms* 'schoss, busen,' MHG. *barmen* 'sich erbarmen,' OHG. *barmōn* 'im schoss halten,' MHG. *barnen* 'eine krippe machen' zu *barn* 'krippe': Goth. *bērusjōs* 'eltern,' OMHG. *gebāren*, MHG. *gebœren* 'sich benehmen,' *bāren* 'äusserliches erscheinen darbieten,' MHG. *ahtbœren* 'achtenswert machen,' *bāren*, *bœren* 'auf die bahre legen,' *bāre* 'totenbahre': OHG. *burdinōn* 'belasten' zu *burdī* 'bürde,' MHG. *bürden*, *bürdenen* 'zu tragen geben.'

250. MHG. *brehen* 'glänzen, funkeln'

MHG. *brehen*, *brehenen* 'leuchten, glänzen': ON. *brā* 'funkeln,' *braga* 'flamme,' Goth. *brahw* 'blinken.' *Brehen* is prob. strong by analogy in MHG.

251. Goth. *brikan* 'brechen'

OHG. *ana-brechōn* 'losbrechen,' *brecho* 'einbrecher': ON. *braka* 'crash': OHG. *brāchōn*, MHG. *brāchen* 'den boden nach der ernte umbrechen,' zu *brāche* 'umgebrochenes land nicht

besäet,' OHG. *prāhhan*, MHG. *brœchen* 'prägen,' *brœche* 'das brechen': Goth. *usbruknan* 'abgebrochen werden,' zu *gabruka* 'brocken,' OHG. *brochōn*, MHG. *brocken*, *brücken* 'brocken, zerbröckeln,' OHG. *prochosōn* 'zerbrechen.'

252. OHG. *twelan* 'TORPERE, STEIF WERDEN'

OHG. *twaljan*, *twellen*, MHG. *tweln* 'aufhalten, zögern, verzögern,' MLG. *dwalen* 'irre, töricht, unsinnig sein,' OE. *dwelian* 'lead astray; lead into error; deceive; thwart, afflict,' Goth. *dwals* 'töricht,' *dwalmōn* 'töricht sein,' OHG. *twalm* 'betäubung': OHG. *twāla* 'aufenthalt, zögerung,' *twālōn*, *twālēn*, MHG. *twālen* 'zögern, verziehen': OE. *dwolian* 'stray, err,' OHG. *gitwola* 'betörung,' *tol*, *tulisc* 'stultus, toll.'

253. OHG. *helan* 'GEHEIM HALTEN, VERHEHLEN'

Goth. *hilms*, OHG. *helm* 'helm': Goth. *halja* 'hölle,' OHG. *hellen* 'velare,' MHG. *hellen* 'in die hölle bringen': OHG. *hāli*, MHG. *hāle* 'verborgen; verhehlen,' *verhœlen* 'verheimlichen': Goth. *huljan*, OHG. *huljan*, MHG. *hüllen* 'hüllen, verhüllen,' Goth. *ushulōn*, OHG. *irholōn* 'aushöhlen,' OHG. *hol* 'hohl,' Goth. *hulundi* 'höhle.'

254. GOTH. *man* PRET. PRES. 'ICH MEINE'

OHG. *manēn*, *manōn*, MHG. *manen* 'ermahnen,' Goth. pret. pres. *man:* *munum*, inf. *munan* 'meinen, glauben,' *munan* wk. 'gedenken,' ON. *muna* 'sich erinnern,' OE. *gemunan* 'eingedenk sein,' OS. *farmunan* 'verleugnen,' OHG. *bimunigōn*, MHG. *münigen* 'ermahnen erinnern,' MHG. *mun* 'gedanke, absicht.' Cf. Goth. *anaminds* 'verdacht, *gaminþi* 'andenken,' OHG. *minna*, MHG. *minne* 'liebe,' OHG. *minnōn*, MHG. *minnen* 'lieben,' Goth. *gamunds* 'andenken, gedächtnis.'

255. OHG. *quelan* 'SCHMERZEN, LEIDEN'

OHG. *quellan*, MHG. *quellen* 'quälen,' OHG. *qualm* 'qual': *quāla*, OMHG. *chōle* 'qual, marter': MHG. *kollen* 'quälen.'

256. GOTH. *skal* PRET. PRES. 'ICH SOLL'

Goth. *skal*, OHG. *scal*, MHG. *sal:* pl. Goth. *skulum*, OHG. *sculun*, MHG. *sculen*, *suln* 'soll, sollen,' Goth. inf. *skulan*, OHG.

scolan, MHG. *scholn*, *soln* 'schuldig sein, sollen,' etc. Cf. OHG. *ferscolden*, MHG. *verschulden* 'in schuld geraten,' OHG. *sculdigōn*, MHG. *sculdigen* 'einen beschuldigen,' OHG. *sculdan*, *schulden* 'beschuldigen,' OHG. *sculdōn* 'sich schuldig machen,' etc.

257. OHG. *sceran* 'SCHEREN'

OHG. *scar* 'pflugeisen,' *scartan*, MHG. *scherten* 'verletzen, abschneiden': OHG. *scāra*, MHG. *schære* 'schere,' *schæren* 'die mausser bestehen': MHG. *schuor* 'schur; schererei, plage.' Cf. *skerran*, No. 201.

258. OE. *screpan* 'KRATZEN'

MHG. *schraffen*, *schrepfen*, *scraffizen* 'schröpfen': *schroffen* 'schröpfen,' *schroffe* 'schroffer fels,' OMHG. *scruffen* 'spalten.' Cf. OHG. *screvōn* 'ritzen,' and OE. *sceorpan*, No. 200.

259. OHG. *sprehhan* 'SPRECHEN'

OHG. *bi-sprehhōn* 'verleumden,' *sprāchōn* 'schwatzen, sprechen,' MHG. *aftersprāchen* 'nachreden': MHG. *spruch:* ON. *spraka* 'prasseln.'

260. OHG. *stechan* 'STECHEN'

OHG. *stechōn* 'stimulare,' Goth. *stiks* 'punkt,' MHG. *stich:* OHG. *stecchen*, MHG. *stecken* 'festheften,' Goth. *stakeins* 'steckung,' ON. *stake* 'stecken.'

261. MHG. *stemen* 'EINHALT TUN'

OHG. *ki-stemen* 'stillen,' MHG. *stemmen* 'stehn machen': OHG. *ungistuomi* 'stürmisch.' Cf. OHG. *stammēn*, *stammalōn*, MHG. *stammeln* 'stammeln': OHG. *stummēn*, MHG. *stumben* 'stumm sein, werden.'

262. OHG. *stredan* 'BRAUSEN, STRUDELN'

MHG. *stradem* 'strudel': late MHG. *strudeln*, *strodlen* 'vor hitze wallen.'

263. OE. *swelan* 'SICH ENTZÜNDEN, LANGSAM OHNE FLAMME BRENNEN'

OHG. *swilizōn* 'sengen, rösten,' MHG. *swilichen* 'tepere,' OHG. *swelchēn*, MHG. *swelken* 'welk werden, sein': Du. *swalk* 'dicker dampf': OE. *forswœlan* 'verbrennen,' ON. *swœla* 'smoke': OE. *swōl* 'schwül,' NHG. *schwül:* Du. *swulk* 'dicker dampf.'

264. OHG. *sweran* 'WEHE TUN, SCHWÄREN'

MHG. *geswer* 'geschwür': OHG. *swāri* 'schwer,' *swārēn*, MHG. *swāren* 'schwer, schmerzlich, lästig sein,' OHG. *swāren*, MHG. *swæren* 'beschweren, belästigen.'

265. GOTH. *gatiman* 'GEZIEMEN'

OHG. *zimilīh* 'schicklich,' MHG. *zimen* 'dünken': Goth. *gatamjan* 'zähmen,' OHG. *zemman*, MHG. *zemen* 'zähmen,' OHG. *zamōn*, MHG. *zamen* 'zahm werden': OHG. *gizāmi* 'wohlgefälligkeit': OHG. *widar-zuomi* 'widersinnig': OHG. *zunft* 'gesetz, schicklichkeit,' *zumpften* 'ornare,' MHG. *zünfen* 'der schicklichkeit gemäss mitteilen.'

266. GOTH. *dis-tairan* 'ZERREISSEN'

OHG. *zerran*, MHG. *zerren* 'reissen, zerreissen,' Goth. *gatarnjan* 'entfremden,' OHG. *uo-zarnen* 'spernere' (Wood, *IE*, a^x: $a^x i$, etc., p. 72): Goth. *aftaurnan* 'abreissen,' OHG. *zornōn* 'zornig sein,' *zurnan*, MHG. *zürnen* 'zürnen über,' OHG. *uo-zurnen* 'spernere.'

267. OS. *tregan* 'LEID SEIN'

Goth. *trigō* 'unwilligkeit, trauer,' ON. *trege* 'sorge': OE. *trāg* 'unwillig, träge,' OS. *trāgi* 'verdruss,' OHG. *trāgi* 'unwillig verdrossen, träge,' *trāgēn*, *trākōn* 'träge werden.'

268. GOTH. *trudan* 'TRETEN'

MHG. *tret* 'tritt,' *tritteln* 'trippeln': OHG. *tretten*, MHG. *treten* 'stampfen': OHG. *trottōn* 'treten,' MHG. *trotten* 'mit kurzen schritten laufen.' Cf. OHG. *tretan* st. 'treten' of the fifth class.

269. OHG. **zwēchan* 'KLEMMEN, KNEIPEN, *gizwochana* 'TRISTIS'

MHG. *zwec* 'nagel,' *zwic* 'kniff mit der zange,' OHG. *zwicjan*, MHG. *zwicken* 'fest klemmen, stecken,' OHG. *zwechōn* 'carpere': MHG. *zwacken* 'zupfen, zerren, klemmen.'

270. OHG. *dweran* 'SCHNELL HERUMDREHEN, MISCHEN'

OHG. *twarōn* 'durcheinander gemischt sein,' *twarc* 'gekäste milch.'

CLASS V

271. Goth. **diwan*, pp. *diwans* 'sterblich'

OHG. [*tawalōn*] *dawalōn* 'hinsterben.' Cf. ON. *deyja* (**daw-*, **dau-*) 'sterben' st., OHG. *touwen* 'sterben,' Goth. *dauþjan* 'töten,' etc.

272. OHG. *gi-fehan* 'sich freuen'

OHG. *fehōn* 'bereiten, pflegen,' OS. *gifehon* 'mit fruchtbarkeit versehen': Goth. *fullafahjan* 'genüge leisten,' Goth. *fahēþs* 'freude,' *faginōn* 'sich freuen': Goth. *gafēhaba* 'anständig.' Cf. *gafahrjan* 'zubereiten,' OS. *fōgian*, OHG. *fuogan* 'fügen,' No. 548.

273. OHG. *fezzan* 'hinfallen, fallen dass eine spur bleibt'

OHG. *fezzera*, MHG. *vezzer* 'fessel,' OHG. *fizza*, MHG. *vitze* 'a number of reeled threads tied together, skein': OHG. *fazzōn*, MHG. *vazzen* 'rüsten, fassen, kleiden, zusammennehmen,' OHG. *faz*, MHG. *vaz*, NHG. *fass* 'cask, vessel, chest,' OHG. *fazzil*, MHG. *vezzel* 'band das etwas trägt oder festhält, ON. *fat* 'kleid,' MHG. *vetzen* 'reissen, zerfetzen': Goth. *fētjan* 'schmücken,' OE. *fǣted*, 'geschmückt,' MHG. *gevǣze* 'gefäss': Goth. *fōtus*, OHG. *fuoz* 'fuss.' (Kluge gives *ë* in *vetze*.)

274. Goth. *fraihnan* 'fragen'

MHG. *vregen* 'fragen': OHG. *rāt-frāgōn* 'consulere,' *rāt-frāganōn* the same, *frāgēn*, MHG. *vrāgen*, OS. *frāgon* 'fragen.' Cf. OHG. *fergōn*, *forscōn*, etc.

275. Goth. *giban* 'geben, schenken'

Goth. *giba* 'gabe,' OHG. *giftan*, MHG. *giften* 'geben, schenken,' OHG. *gebēn*, *gebōn*, MHG. *geben* 'einem ein geschenk machen': *gāben* the same, *gābe*, *gābunge* 'gabe.' Here may belong Goth. *gabigjan* 'bereichern,' *gabignan* 'reich sein,' *gabigs* 'reich,' *gabei* 'reichtum,' cf. Uhlenbeck, *Et. Wb.*, *s. v. gabei*.

276. Goth. *bi-gitan* 'finden, erlangen'

MHG. *ā-gez* 'vergessenheit, *ver-āgezzen* 'vergessen': OHG. *irgezzen*, MHG. *ergetzen* 'einen eines dinges vergessen machen': ON. *gāta* 'rätsel.'

277. GOTH. *itan* 'ESSEN'

Goth. *fra-atjan* 'zur speisung austeilen,' OHG. *ezzen* 'speisen, beköstigen,' MHG. *atzen, etzen* the same: OHG. *āzīg* 'geniessbar,' MHG. *æzen* 'speisen,' Goth. *uz-ēta* 'krippe.' Cf. MHG. *ās* 'aas,' *āsen* 'ein aas wittern u. verfolgen.'

278. OHG. *jesan* 'GÄHREN

MHG. *jest* 'schaum,' *jesten* 'schäumen': OHG. *jerjan* 'gähren machen.'

279. GOTH. *ligan* 'LIEGEN'

MHG. *ligern, legern* 'liegen, lagern': Goth. *lagjan* 'liegen machen,' OHG. *leggan*, MHG. *legen*, Goth. *lageins* 'legung': OHG. *lāgōn, lāgēn* 'auflauern, nachstellen,' *lāga* 'liegen, lage.'

280. OHG. *lechen* 'LECK WERDEN'

OHG. *licken*, MHG. *lichen* 'durchseihen,' *lechen* 'austrocknen,' *lechezen* intens.: OHG. *lechen*, MHG. *lecken* 'benetzen.'

281. GOTH. *mag* 'ICH KANN,' PRET. PRES.

Goth. *mag*, OHG. *mag*, MHG. *mac* 'ich kann, vermag,' MHG. *magen* 'kraft, macht,' Goth. *mahts* 'macht,' *anamahtjan* 'gewaltsam behandeln': OHG. *mugan*, MHG. *mügen, mugen* 'können, vermögen' (with later *u* after anal. of *sculun*). Cf. Goth. *magus* 'knabe': *mēgs* 'schwiegersohn.'

282. GOTH. *mitan* 'MESSEN'

Goth. *mitōn* 'ermessen, denken,' OHG. *mezzōn*, MHG. *mezzen* 'mässigen': Goth. *usmēt* 'aufenthalt, verhalten,' MHG. *māz*, 'gefäss zum messen, grad, art u. weise,' OHG. *ebenmāzōn*, MHG. *ebenmāzen* 'gleichstellen, vergleichen,' MHG. *māzen* 'mässigen, abmessen,' *mæzen* 'entfernen,' *mæzigen* 'mässigen.' Cf. MHG. *mestern* 'messen.'

283. GOTH. *ganisan* 'GENESEN'

Goth. *gansjan* 'verursachen?' (cf. Uhlenbeck, *Et. Wb.*): *ganists* 'heilung': *ganasjan* 'gesund machen,' OHG. *nerian*, MHG. *nerigen, nern* 'heilen': ON. *nǣra* 'nähren.'

284. Goth. *niþan* 'unterstützen'

OHG. *ginâda* 'gnade,' *ginâdên* 'gnädig sein,' *ganâdigôn*, MHG. *gnâden.*

285. Goth. *qiþan* 'sagen, sprechen, reden'

OHG. *quitilôn* 'lebhaft sprechen,' MHG. *quitteln* the same, OHG. *harmquetôn* 'maledicere,' *quidi* 'rede': *quettan* OS. *queddian* 'anreden': Goth. *unqēþs* 'unaussprechlich,' ON. *kuæðe* 'lied.'

286. MHG. *regen* 'sich aufmachen, steif, gestreckt sein'

MHG. *ragen* 'ragen, starren,' *regen* 'etwas ragen machen': *ræhe* 'steif, starr.'

287. Goth. *rikan* 'aufhäufen'

Goth. *garaihtjan*, OHG. *garihtan*, 'richten,' MHG. *richten* 'eine richtung, geben,' OHG. *girekôn*, 'richten, ordnen,' MHG. *rechen* 'harken': Goth. *ufrakjan*, OHG. *recchen*, MHG. *recken* 'ausstrecken,' Goth. *rahtôn* 'darreichen.' Cf. OE. *reconian*, OHG. *rehhanôn*, MHG. *rechenen* 'rechnen, zählen,' Goth. *rahnjan* 'rechnen,' OHG. *rahjan* 'sagen, erzählen,' *carachôn* 'narrare,' OHG. *ruohhjan*, MHG. *ruochen* 'bedacht sein,' OHG. *ruoh* 'acht.' Cf. also Goth. *ragin* 'rat,' *raginôn* 'beherrschen,' *garêhsns* 'bestimmung.'

288. Goth. *sitan* 'sitzen'

Goth. *sitls* 'sitz, sessel': *satjan*, OHG. *sezzen*, MHG. *setzen* 'setzen,' *ursatzen* 'ersetzen, vergüten,' *besazen* 'festhalten, in gewalt bringen': *undersâzen* 'unterstützen, Goth. *andasêts* 'entsetzlich, abscheulich.' Cf. OHG. *sedal* 'sitz, sessel,' MHG. *sidelen* 'ansiedeln,' *sedelen* 'sich setzen.'

289. Goth. *sniwan* 'eilen'

Cf. forms of the second class that may be grouped here. OE. *snēowan* 'hasten,' *snūd* 'sudden; speed,' Goth. *sniumjan* 'eilen,' ON. *snyðia* 'eilen.' Cf. OE. *snēowan*, No. 127.

290. OE. *specan* 'sprechen'

MHG. *speht* 'schwätzer': *spahen* 'geschwätz,' *spehten* 'schwatzen': OE. *spæc* 'speech.'

291. OE. *swefan* 'CEASE, SLEEP'

OE. *swefn* 'sleep, dream,' *swefnian*, 'appear in a dream': *swebban* 'put to sleep, death,' OHG. *swebjan* 'schläfrig machen, einschläfern': ON *sǫfa* (**swōbjan*) 'feierlich töten': *sūæfa* 'einschläfern.'

292. OHG. *trehhan* 'SCHIEBEN, ZIEHEN'

MHG. *trecken* (**trak-*) intens. 'ziehen.'

293. OHG. *weban* 'HIN U. HER SCHWANKEN, WEBEN, SPINNEN'

OHG. *wibil* 'mistkäfer,' *weval* 'einschlag beim gewebe,' MHG. *wibelen* 'wimmern,' *wifelen* 'mit der nadel stopfen,' *weberen* 'sich hin u. her bewegen,' *webelen* 'hin u. her schwanken': *wabelen*, *waben*, *waberen* 'in bewegung sein.' Cf. OE. *wafian* 'wave': ON. *vāfa* 'vibrate.'

294. GOTH. *gawidan* 'VERBINDEN'

Goth. *gawiss* 'verbindung, gelenk': OHG. *giwāten*, MHG. *gewæten* 'kleiden,' OHG. *wātōn* 'bekleiden,' *wāt* 'kleidung.'

295. GOTH. *gawigan* 'BEWEGEN'

Goth. *wigs* 'weg,' OHG. *āwiggōn* 'deviare,' *wegōn* 'wandern, helfen,' MHG. *wegen*, MHG. *wigelen* 'wanken,' *wigen* 'wiegen': Goth. *wagjan* 'bewegen,' OHG. *weggen*, MHG. *wegen* 'schwingen,' OHG. *wagōn*, MHG. *wagen* 'wogen, schwanken': Goth. *wēgs*, OHG. *wāg* 'woge, flut,' MHG. *wāgen* 'auf die wage legen.' Cf. MHG. *wacken*, *wackeln* 'hin u. her schwanken,' *wakzen* intens. of *wacken*, *wagen*.

296. OHG. *wehan* 'BLINKEN'

OHG. *wāhi* 'schön, zierlich,' MHG. *wœhen* 'gestalten, verherrlichen.'

297. GOTH. *wisan* 'SEIN'

Goth. *wizōn* 'schwelgen,' OHG. *werēn*, MHG. *wern* 'dauern, leisten,' MHG. *verwesen* 'jemandes stelle vertreten': OS. *waron* 'dauern': OHG. *wār* 'wahr'?

298. GOTH. *wrikan* 'VERFOLGEN'

Goth. *wrakjan*, ON. *rekia* 'verfolgen,' Goth. *wraka* 'verfolgung': *wrēkei* 'verfolgt sein.'

CLASS VI

299. OHG. [*bachan*] *pachan* 'BACKEN'

ON. *baka* 'bake,' MHG. *bachern* 'fovere, keep warm,' *becheln* 'sich erwärmen.'

300. GOTH. *faran* 'FAHREN, WANDERN'

Goth. *farjan*, ON. *feria*, OHG. *ferjen* 'schiffen': ON. *fǭra*, OS. *fōrian*, OHG. *fuoran*, MHG. *vüeren* 'führen,' MHG. *vuoren* 'unterhalten,' *vuore* 'fahrt, unterhalt,' OHG. *fuorōn* 'speisen.' Cf. OHG. *ana-fartōn* 'invadere,' MHG. *vertigen* 'zur fahrt ausrüsten,' *vart* 'fahrt,' OHG. *furt* 'bahn,' MHG. *vürten* 'eine furt machen.'

301. OHG. *galan* 'SINGEN'

OHG. *galm* 'schall, ton,' MHG. *galmen* 'schallen,' *gelsen* 'schreien,' OHG. *galstarōn* 'incantare,' *galstar* 'gesang': Goth. *gōljan* 'grüssen.'

302. GOTH. *graban* 'GRABEN'

OHG. [*grabōn*] *grapōn* 'mit graben versehen,' MHG. *greften* 'graben, umgraben': Goth. *grōba*, OHG. *gruoba* 'grube,' MHG. *gruoben* 'eine grube graben.' Cf. OE. *grēpe* 'trench, burrow,' *gripu* 'kettle,' ON. *grōp* 'aushöhlung,' Sw. *grop* 'grube, grübchen.'

303. GOTH. *hafjan* 'HEBEN, AUFHEBEN'

Goth. *ufar-hafnan* 'sich überheben,' *haftjan* 'sich anheften, anhängen,' OHG. *hevīgōn* 'beschweren,' *biheften*, MHG. *beheften* 'zusammenheften,' OHG. *hebinōn* 'bewirten,' *gehaftēn* 'haften, festsitzen': MHG. *be-huofen* 'bedürfen,' OE. *behōfian* 'need, require.'

304. GOTH. *hlahjan* 'LACHEN'

OHG. *lachēn*, MHG. *lachen* 'lachen, lächeln,' MHG. *lecheln*, *lecherlen* 'lächeln': Goth. *uf-hlōhjan* 'auflachen machen.' Cf. OHG. *hlahhan* redup. 'lachen.'

305. ON. *kala* 'FRIEREN'

E. *chill* (**kali*-): OHG. *chuoli* 'kühl,' OHG. *chuolēn*, *chuolōn*, MHG. *kuolen* 'kühl werden,' OHG. *chuolan*, MHG. *küelen* 'kühl machen,' OE. *cōlian* 'erkalten.' Cf. Goth. *kalds* 'kalt,' OHG. *caltēn* 'kalt werden.'

306. GOTH. *malan* 'MAHLEN'

Goth. *malō* 'motte': OHG. *muljan*, MHG. *müllen* 'zerstossen, zermalmen,' OHG. *gimulli*, MHG. *gemülle* 'staub.' Cf. OHG. *melo*, etc., No. 463.

307. GOTH. *ganah* PRET. PRES. 'ES GENÜGT'

Goth. *ganah* 'es genügt': Goth. *ganōhjan*, OHG. *ginuogan*, MHG. *genüegen* 'genüge leisten,' Goth. *ganōhnan* 'genug werden,' Goth. *ganōhs*, OHG. *ginuog* 'genug.' Cf. *biniuhsjan*, No. 402.

308. GOTH. *sakan* 'STREITEN'

Goth. *gasahts* 'vorwurf, tadel,' OHG. *sahha* 'streit,' ON. *sakna* 'miss,' Goth. *gafri-sahtjan* 'abbilden,' *-frisahtnan* 'gebildet werden,' MHG. *besachen* 'ins werk setzen': *unandsōks* 'unbestreitbar,' OHG. *suoh* 'suchen,' Goth. *sōkjan* 'suchen,' OHG. *suohhen*, MHG. *suochen* 'suchen.'

309. GOTH. *skaban* 'SCHEREN, KRATZEN'

MHG. *schüepen* 'mit schuppen versehen,' *entschuopen* 'entschuppen,' OHG. *scuopa* 'schuppe.'

310. OHG. *spanan* 'LOCKEN, REIZEN'

OHG. *spennen*, MHG. *spenen* 'anreizen,' MHG. *spenen* 'von der mutterbrust entwöhnen.' Cf. OHG. *spuon* [*spuoan*] 'von statten gehen,' *gespuotōn* 'beschleunigen,' *spuot* 'fortgang, gelingen.'

311. GOTH. *standan* 'STEHEN'

Goth. *anastōdjan* 'anfangen,' *gastōþanan* 'zum stehen bringen,' *gastōþan* 'feststellen,' MHG. *stuodelen* 'festhalten': Goth. *usstass* 'auferstehung,' *staþs* 'stätte; ufer,' OHG. *stadōn* 'landen,' etc., *stedjan* 'landen, anlegen.' Cf. also ON. *stǫðua* 'aufhalten' and *statōn*, No. 571.

312. OE. *stæppan* 'SCHREITEN, GEHEN'

OHG. *staph* 'fussstapfe,' *stephan* 'treten, schreiten,' *staphōn*, MHG. *stapfen* 'auftreten, schreiten,' MHG. *stapfeln* 'mit stufen versehen': OS. *stōpo* 'tritt,' *stōpian* 'schreiten machen,' MHG. *stüefen* 'hervorbringen, anstiften.' Cf. OHG. *stab* 'stab,' *stabēn* 'steif sein,' *stampf* 'stämpfel,' *stampfōn* 'stampfen.'

313. OHG. **giwahan*, PRES. *giuuahinen* 'GEDENKEN, BEMERKEN'

OHG. *gawahanjan*, MHG. *gewehenen* 'gedenken': MHG. *wüegen* 'in erinnerung bringen.'

314. GOTH. *wakan* 'WACHEN, WACHSAM SEIN'

Goth. *gawaknan* 'erwachen, erweckt werden,' *uswakjan* 'aufwecken,' OHG. *wecchan* 'wecken,' *wahhēn*, *wachōn*, MHG. *wachen* 'wachen,' OHG. *wahtēn* 'wache halten': Goth. *wōkrs* 'wucher, gewinn,' OHG. *wuocherōn*, MHG. *wuocheren* 'frucht bringen, wuchern.' Cf. Goth. *wahsjan* 'wachsen' st.

CLASS VII

315. OHG. *plāhan* 'BLASEN, BLÄHEN'

OHG. *blāen*, MHG. *blœjen* 'blasen, blähen': OHG. *bluojen*, MHG. *blüejen*, 'blühen,' OS. *blōian* 'blow': OHG., MHG. *blat* 'blatt.'

316. GOTH. *grētan* 'WEINEN, KLAGEND RUFEN'

Goth. *grēts* 'das weinen,' ON. *grātr* 'das weinen,' MHG. *grāz* 'wut, übermut,' *grāzen*, *grāzieren* 'erregung durch geberden ausdruck geben, schreien'; ON. *grǿta* 'zum weinen bringen,' OS. *grōtian* 'einen angehen, anreden,' OHG. *gruozen* 'antreiben; angreifen; anreden; grüssen,' MHG. *grüezen:* MHG. *graz* 'wütend.'

317. ON. *huāta* REDUP. 'DURCHBOHREN,' OHG. *farwāzan* 'VERFLUCHEN'

Goth. *hwōtjan* 'drohen, schelten, strafen,' *hwōta* 'drohung': *gahwatjan* 'anreizen, wetzen,' OHG. *hwazzan*, *wezzen*, MHG. *wetzen* 'wetzen,' OHG. *hwaz* 'scharf, spitz.'

318. OE. *cnāwan* REDUP. 'NOSCERE'

OHG. *ir-chnāan* 'können, vermögen': *irknuodilen* 'vernehmbar werden.' Cf. Goth. *kunnan* 'kennen,' etc., No. 180.

319. GOTH. *lētan* 'LASSEN, ZULASSEN'

Goth. *andlētnan* 'entlassen werden,' MHG. *antlāz* 'ablass,' *antlāzen* 'loslassen, vergeben': Goth. *lats* 'träge,' *latjan* 'träge

machen,' OHG. *lezzan* 'hemmen,' *lazōn*, MHG. *lazzen* 'träge sein.'

320. GOTH. *ur-rēdan* 'BESTIMMEN'

OHG. *rātiscōn* 'raten,' MHG. *rætischen* 'rätsel aufgeben': Goth. *rōdjan* 'reden': MHG. *retzelen* 'rätsel aufgeben?'

321. GOTH. *slēpan* REDUP. 'SCHLAFEN'

ON. *slāpr* 'schlaffer mensch,' OHG. *slāfōn*, *slāferōn* impers. 'schläfern': OHG. *slaf* 'schlaff, *slaffēn*, MHG. *slaffen* 'schlaff sein,' ON. *slapa* 'los hangen,' *slepia* 'schleimen.'

CHARLES GOETTSCH

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

AUTHORSHIP OF *REVENGE FOR HONOUR*

I

The title-page of the first edition of this tragedy contains these words: "Revenge for Honour. A Tragedie, by George Chapman. London, printed for Richard Marriot, in S. Dunstan's Churchyard, Fleetstreet. 1654." *The Parricide, or Revenge for Honor* was entered in the Stationers' Register, November 29, 1653, for the same publisher, with the name of Glapthorne as the author. Another probable early mention of this play is found in Sir Henry Herbert's license-book for May 27, 1624: "For the Prince's Company. A play called The Parracide."[1]

That the same publisher within the period of one year ascribed *Revenge for Honour* to two different playwrights invalidates the credibility of the title-page. Even if this were not the case, absolute trust could not be given to the unsupported testimony of this title-page, printed twenty years after Chapman's death, and forty years after the time at which he is thought to have ceased writing for the stage. Perhaps Marriot was ignorant or uncertain of the authorship. If this was the case, there was an advantage in attributing the play to Chapman, who was long since dead, rather than to Glapthorne, who we know was in 1643 still publishing poems, and who in 1654 either was still alive or had only more or less recently died.[2] That Chapman's name was still well known to the reading public and therefore desirable for title-page use is shown by the reprinting of *Caesar and Pompey* in 1653, and of *Bussy D'Ambois* in 1641, 1646, and 1657, by the continuous popularity of the Homer translations, by the appearance of *The Ball* and *Philip Chabot* in 1639 with Chapman's name in both cases preceding Shirley's on the title-page, and by the publication under Chapman's name in the same year with *Revenge for Honour* of the probably spurious tragedy *Alphonsus, Emperor of*

[1] Taken from Mr. F. G. Fleay's transcription of the License-book in his *Chronicle of the London Stage.*

[2] We do not know the date of his death. His slight biography has not been traced later than 1643. See A. H. B.'s article on Glapthorne in *Dict. Nat. Biog.*

Germany. The improbability of his having written the last-named play increases, I may suggest, the improbability of his having written *Revenge for Honour*.

An examination of the play itself reveals the presence of different subjects, methods of workmanship, and qualities of style from those found in Chapman's known works.

Of the six tragedies certainly written in whole or in part by him—the two Bussy plays, the two Biron plays, *Chabot*, and *Caesar and Pompey*—five are placed in France and deal with characters and events of French history, and the remaining one has a subject taken from Roman history. All of his tragedies profit thus from the dignity that may be found in historical subjects and the popular interest legitimately attaching to them. They are not, however, chronicle-plays, but tragedies. Chapman's treatment of his sources is somewhat like that of Shakspere; for example, in the case of the Biron plays and *Caesar and Pompey*, as Professor Koeppel[1] and Professor Boas[2] have shown, he follows his sources with a mixture of freedom and fidelity, being willing, when it suited his purpose, to be a mere poetic translator or rearranger of his sources. *Revenge for Honour* has a subject of a very different nature from that of any of Chapman's known works. Its origin is neither classical nor French; the scene is laid in a part of the world in which Chapman has in his known dramas shown no interest; and the historical element common to all of his known tragedies is here absent. A source has been suggested by Professor Schick in the story of the Turkish prince, Mustapha, which is contained in Knolles' *History of the Turks* (1603). Diligent search by Professor Koeppel and others has failed to reveal any other source. If the Mustapha story supplied the substance borrowed by the author of *Revenge for Honour*, it will be agreed that he made only the freest and slightest use of it. Probably a complete source does not exist. Professor Koeppel believes that the dramatist developed the plan himself with a free use of elements found on the stage and in the literature of the time, which he put together into a new complete whole.

[1] *Quellen und Forschungen*, 1897.

[2] Introd. to Chapman's tragedies in "Belles-Lettres Series."

This after all amounts to saying that the author in collecting his material and constructing the play proceeded according to the methods of the Fletcherian or eclectic school, rather than to those of the earlier dramatists among whom Chapman's development took place.

Revenge for Honour does not accord with the theory and practice of tragedy-writing illustrated in all of Chapman's undoubted tragedies and in part enunciated in the Dedication prefixed to the *Revenge of Bussy*. "Material instruction" and "elegant and sententious excitation to virtue and deflection from her contrary" are so fully present in Chapman's tragedies as to form perhaps their most striking characteristic. In *Revenge for Honour* moralizing and didactic speeches are not to be found; and neither the rant and bombast of Chapman nor his lofty flights of poetry are to be matched there.

Of the two rather completely differentiated species of the Tragedy of Blood seen on the Elizabethan stage, all of Chapman's undoubted tragedies point to the structural method of the one, *Revenge for Honour* to that of the other. These two general species[1] are respectively the Kyd type (e. g., *Spanish Tragedy*, *Hamlet*, Marston's *Antonio's Revenge*, Tourneur's tragedies, and Webster's *White Devil* and *Duchess of Malfi*) and the Marlowe type (e. g., *Jew of Malta*, *Lust's Dominion*, *Massacre of Paris*). The Senecan influence in Chapman is stronger than is usual in the dramatists of the so-called Kyd school; much of it is of Seneca rather than of Kyd, whether derived directly or through the medium of English theatrical conventions. Examples of Senecan influence are the Nuntius in *Bussy* (II, i) and *Caesar and Pompey* (II, i), long narrative passages in *Revenge of Bussy* (IV, i) and *Biron's Conspiracy* (IV, i, the whole scene), the Umbra in *Bussy* and *Revenge of Bussy*, the Stoic suicide of Clermont D'Ambois and Cato, and the large amount of Senecan philosophizing and moralizing in all the tragedies. These qualities are wanting in *Revenge for Honour*, as they are in the Marlowe type generally.

[1] For this classification I am partly indebted to Dr. E. E. Stoll's *John Webster*, pp. 94 ff., and to Professor F. G. Hubbard's "Repetition and Parallelism in Elizabethan Drama," in *Mod. Lang. Ass'n. Pub.*, Vol. XX, p. 375.

Omens (e. g., *C. and P.*, III, pp. 366, 367;[1] *Bir. Trag.*, IV, p. 256; *Rev. of Bus.*, V, pp. 205*b*, 209*a*), presentiments, and foreshadowings of tragedy (*Bussy*, I, p. 143*b*, and III, p. 154*a*; *Rev. of Bus.*, V, p. 205*b*; *Bir. Trag.*, IV, p. 256; *C. and P.*, III, p. 366*a*) and direct supernatural prophecies (of spirits in *Bussy*, IV, pp. 166–68, and *Rev. of Bus.*, V, p. 209*a*, of an astrologer in *Bir. Conspir.*, III, p. 232*b*, of a soothsayer in *C. and P.*, III, p. 366*b*, and in a dream in *Rev. of Bus.*, V, p. 208*b*) are also absent from *Revenge for Honour*, as is the element of fatalism that we feel in the presence of supernatural forces, and that is sometimes put into expression by the characters themselves (e. g., Tamyra's speech, *Bussy*, III, p. 154*b*). The motives which lead up to the bloody conclusions of *Bussy* and *Revenge of Bussy* and in general of plays of this type are those of duty imposed from without on the avenger, of revenge felt to be righteous. On the contrary, in the Marlowe type of the Tragedy of Blood, the motive is not sacred nor is it obligatory on the protagonist; it is a matter of lust, ambition, or personal resentment. So it is in *Revenge for Honour*. In short, this tragedy is neither conceived nor executed in the same spirit as those of Chapman: it shows a different bent of mind and results of training in a different dramatic school.

Want of symmetry in dramatic structure, subordination of action and movement to declamation, and excellence in details, and especially in rhetorical, poetic, and often epical passages, rather than in the dramatic whole, are qualities that in varying degrees belong to all of Chapman's tragedies. Of *Revenge for Honour* the dramatic structure is sufficiently regular and careful. It moves consistently forward, though slowly until near the end; the love story and the story of political intrigue are so closely intertwined as to become practically identical; the few short comic scenes do not lose sight of the real plot and do not long hold the attention from it. There is no trace of the ethical declamations of Clermont and Cato, the passion, boastfulness, and rant of Bussy and Biron, the episodic structure of *Revenge of Bussy*, the Biron plays, and *Caesar and Pompey*, and the strong narrative element

[1] References by act and page to *Revenge for Honour* and Chapman's plays are made to R. H. Shepherd's ed. of Chapman's works (1874). In the few instances where scene and line are given for *Bus.* and *Rev. of Bus.*, the "Belles Lettres" volume of Chapman is meant.

already mentioned. Chapman's idiosyncrasies of weakness and strength are alike absent. Moreover, the general management and machinery of the plot are different. To the audience it is always clear what Chapman's characters plan to do: when an action takes place, we are prepared for it, and there is never need of looking back in the light of after-events to understand what has happened previously. This is in general the procedure of the earlier dramatists including Shakspere. With *Revenge for Honour* it is quite different. The unexpected happens again and again: the audience is not in the confidence of the author, but is often kept as much in the dark as are the characters of the tragedy themselves. The purpose of Abilqualit's whispered consultations with Mesithes (II, p. 427*b*) and with the Mutes (III, p. 435*a*) come to light only later on in the action. The giving way of Caropia to Abilqualit's wooing (II, p. 428*b*), her murder of her husband (IV, p. 441*a*), the stabbing of Caropia by Abrahen (V, p. 447*a*), the latter's suicide (V, p. 447*a*), and Abilqualit's death at the hands of Caropia (V, p. 447*b*), are all surprises. The motive is revealed in each case *after* the act. The concealment of the plan until its consummation is obviously deliberate on the part of the author. This is one of the tricks of the later or Fletcherian school.[1]

The style shows no trace whatever of the involved syntax, of the want of distinct articulation, of the heavy obscurity that so often attend Chapman's style. The swelling speech, the grandiloquence and hyperbole of the D'Ambois and Biron plays[2] are also wanting in *Revenge for Honour*. There is, indeed, exaggeration and inflation in a few of the speeches of Mura and Abrahen,[3] but it is of a different kind: it is tamer and more conventional, and it wants Chapman's energy, boldness, and vigor. Clarity and ease of expression and gracefulness of imagery are prevailing characteristics of the style of *Revenge for Honour*. Mr. Swinburne has spoken of the "close and intense observation of nature . . . . at all times distinctive of this poet" (Chapman), and of his "quaint

[1] This Fletcherian characteristic is dwelt on by Dr. E. E. Stoll in his *John Webster*, pp. 171 ff. On p. 10 I have cited examples of its use by Fletcher.

[2] E. g., *Bussy*, pp. 147*a*, *b*, 163*b*, 164*a*; *Biron Consp.*, pp. 230*a*, 238*b*, 239*a*.

[3] E. g., *Rev. Hon.*, pp. 431*b*, 444*b*.

fondness for remote and eccentric illustration."[1] In *Revenge for Honour* there are also many figures of speech taken from nature. It is here, perhaps, that the play comes nearest to Chapman. Even in this respect, however, the resemblance is not close or significant. Though a few of the images in the disputed play are original and striking,[2] the greater number are conventional.[3] They possess grace, clearness, and fitness, qualities for which Chapman is not remarkable. There is also wanting the setting within which Chapman's figures are most multiplied, that of "elegant and sententious" moralizing and of active narration and description. Nowhere, moreover, is there a striking parallelism[4] or a close resemblance to Chapman.

Chapman's diction contains many words used in their direct etymological rather than derived sense and a few directly formed by him from classical sources and used instead of the slightly different current form.[5] There is nothing of this kind in *Revenge for Honour*.

The versification is of the looser kind. Feminine endings abound; the lines, like those of Fletcher, sometimes defy scansion —they must be "felt rather than scanned;" and lines of more than

[1] Professor F. I. Carpenter has given many examples of these traits in his *Metaphor and Simile in the Minor Elizabethan Drama*, pp. 106 ff.

[2] Pp. 429*b*, 432*a*, 443*b*.

[3] "Transparent as clear air or crystal" (p. 422*b*); "like a thick cloud 'tween me and greatness" (p. 422*b*); "like melancholy turtles" (p. 423*b*); "dangers like swift lightning" (p. 427*a*); "vice like a small cloud" spreads (p. 434*a*); chastity, "the brightest star in the heaven of virtues" (p. 436*b*); "like the young phoenix" (p. 444*a*); eyes compared to diamonds (p. 444*a*); etc.

[4] *Rev. Hon.*, p. 447*a*, has the words, "to procure her passage | To the eternal dwellings." Cf. *Bus. D'Am.*, p. 175*b* (in "Belles-Lettres Series," V, iv, ll. 107, 108), "and tell them all that D'Ambois now is hasting | To the eternal dwellers." This slight dictional parallel may easily be accidental, or it may be due to a common borrowing from a classical source. Professor Boas has shown that the passage in *Bus. D'Am.* closely follows Seneca, *Her. Oct.*, pp. 1525, 1526 (see note on the passage in "Belles-Lettres Series").

[5] "Adust" (*Bir. Consp.*, p. 224*a*) = scorched, parched; from L. adurere = to burn.
"Expuate" (*Bir. Consp.*, p. 222*b*) = spit out, ejected; *N. E. D.* cites only this passage.
"Euicts" (*C. and P.*, p. 373*b*) = extorts; "euiction" (*Bir. Tr.*, p. 268*b*) = conviction.
"Innative" (*Rev. of Bus.*, II, i, 159,) = innate, native (rare and obs., *N. E. D.*).
"Exquire" (*Bussy*, IV, iii, 29) = find out by searching.
"Maritorious" (*Rev. of Bus.*, II, ii, 34) = fond of one's husband.
"Abhorreth" (*Bussy*, V, iv, 28) = shrinks from with dread.
"Gurmundist" (*Bussy*, I, i, 59) = epicure. *N. E. D.* finds this word only in Chapman.
Many more examples could be cited. Several of these are taken from the glossary cards of Professor T. M. Parrott's forthcoming edition of Chapman's dramatic works, which is to be published by Routledge & Co.

the customary length are, in comparison with those of Chapman's undoubted plays, so numerous and so hard to classify that in E. Elste's treatment of Chapman's blank verse[1] a separate list of the longer lines in *Revenge for Honour* was found necessary. The following table taken from Elste's work shows a large gap in the proportion of double endings between Chapman's plays and *Revenge for Honour*, and even a larger gap in the case of the triple endings. The gap between *Alphonsus* and *Revenge for Honour* is also great.

	Verse lines	D. E.	Percentage of D. E.	Trip E.	Percentage of Trip E.	Percentage Rhyme
Bussy	2355	632	26.8	11	.5	6.9
Rev. of Bus.	2374	649	27.3	11	.5	7.9
Bir. Consp.	1936	470	24.3	10	.5	4.
Bir. Tr.	2254	493	21.9	13	.6	5.
Caes. and Pompey.	1860	580	31.2	21	1.1	4.
Alphonsus	2338	305	13.	12	.5	1.2
Rev. Hon.	2169	954	44.	96	4.4	1.

The only hypothesis that can explain Chapman's authorship of a tragedy so different from the rest of his work, is that late in life, apparently after a long cessation from dramatic composition, he resumed play-writing and decided to write a tragedy resembling those being constructed by some of the successful dramatists of the younger school. This means that he chose a subject of a kind not found elsewhere in his works—of oriental court life—treated his sources in a new way, built up the structure much on the plan of one of Fletcher's plays,[2] wrote contrary to his avowed theory of tragedy, excluded omens, presentiments, and supernatural agencies, foreswore his allegiance to the Kyd-Seneca tragedy in order to ally himself with that of the Marlowe tradition, rejected ethicism, declamation, narration, and description, reversed his whole *looking-forward* method of preparing the way carefully for all that was to come to the *looking-backward* method of surprise, constructed smoothly and regularly, expressed himself with ease and grace, employed the Fletcherian versification, and in general cast off like a garment all that had been most distinctive of him, whether of

[1] Emil Elste, *Der Blankvers in den Dramen George Chapmans* (1892), pp. 46–48.

[2] *Cupid's Revenge.* See p. 12 *infra.*

strength or of weakness. Many of these differences are not superficial but fundamental, and seem to represent differences in genius and taste, in inclination and training. That even a poet of much less pronounced and individual manner than Chapman and of less advanced age could so completely have changed is improbable almost to the degree of impossibility and absurdity. For those who ascribe *Alphonsus* to Chapman, the difficulty is even greater, as *Revenge for Honour* shows no more resemblance to its companion late play than it does to Chapman's known work.

II

Who the author of *Revenge for Honour* actually was is not easy to determine with certainty. Even the date of composition is not sure, though it seems probable, as I have said before, that *The Parracide* (entered in the Herbert MS May 27, 1624, for the Prince's Company) is the same as *The Parricide, or Revenge for Honor* (entered in S. R., 1653). In August, 1623, the Prince's Men left the Curtain Theater for the Red Bull.[1] Mr. Fleay sees in the last two lines of the prologue of *Revenge for Honour*—

> You've graced me sometimes in another sphere,
> And I do hope you'll not dislike me here—

an allusion to this change of theaters. If this supposition of Mr. Fleay is correct, additional probability is given to this identification.

Neither the Herbert MS entries nor other contemporary documents have record of a dramatist writing for the Prince's Company at that time to whom we could reasonably attribute *Revenge for Honour*. Dekker and Day's *Bellman of Paris*,[2] Ford, Dekker, and Rowley's *Witch of Edmonton*, "young" Johnson and Broome's *Fault in Friendship*, Ford and Dekker's *Fairy Knight*, Sampson's *Widow's Prize*, five or six old anonymous plays,[3] and *The Parracide* are the only plays that we know that this company acted in

[1] Fleay, *Chron. Hist. of London Stage*, p. 299.

[2] Apparently written originally for the Revels Company. See Fleay's transcript of the Herbert MS in his *Chron. Hist. of London Stage*, p. 301.

[3] Fleay mentions also Barnaby Barnes' *Madcap*. Barnes died in 1609 (see A. H. B.'s article on Barnes in *D. N. B.*); hence this play is too old to be considered.

1623–24; and these with two or three by Middleton and Rowley are the only ones that documentary evidence connects with this company between 1616 and 1632. Little or no resemblance is evident in *Revenge for Honour* to the known productions of any of these dramatists. Dekker and Day are both of an older school than the author of *Revenge for Honour*. Sampson's two extant plays are slipshod in dramatic structure, and wanting in movement and in grasp of the characters. The versification is also unlike that of *Revenge for Honour*. It is bare, fairly regular, and prosaic; it lacks the facility and smoothness and the abundance of feminine endings of the latter. Ford and Broome are in different ways equally unakin to our author. Middleton's versification with its large number of feminine endings is more like that of *Revenge for Honour* than is that of the other dramatists just mentioned. Yet there is not a trace in *Revenge for Honour* of the unmistakable cadence of Middleton's longer serious passages. Middleton's slightness of *enjambement*, almost complete absence of light and weak endings, and great frequency of feminine endings before the caesura are mechanical points that differentiate his verse from that of *Revenge for Honour*. The choice of images and the general aesthetic quality are also quite different.

In order, then, to find dramatic kinship to *Revenge for Honour*, one must look elsewhere than in the work of the few men positively known to have been writing for the Prince's Company at that time. Earlier in this paper I pointed out reminders of Fletcher. The versification shows many double endings and not a few triple endings, and much of the peculiar Fletcherian fall and rhythm. On the other hand, the unstopped lines are numerous; often the verse-construction seems to take the speech, rather than the line, as unit. There is no play of Fletcher in which the *enjambement* is so frequent and so free. Some of this, however, there is in Fletcher, varying from play to play.[1] The accented and often monosyllabic eleventh syllable of the blank

[1] The uncertainty as to whether some of the plays in the Fletcherian cycle are partly by another dramatist makes citation difficult. Some critics tend to regard as un-Fletcherian any passage in a play supposedly by Fletcher which does not contain the extreme type of Fletcher's verse; they do not suppose this facile and expeditious writer able or willing to vary his style even slightly.

verse line, a feature very characteristic of Fletcher, is found fairly often in *Revenge for Honour*.[1]

I have given above (p. 5) illustrations of the use by the author of *Revenge for Honour* of the "method of surprise," an effective means by which Fletcher stimulated and sustained interest.[2] Indeed, numerous common devices and parallels in situation are found in *Revenge for Honour* and plays of Fletcher. Abilqualit's disclosing to Tarifa in asides (*Rev. Hon.*, IV, p. 437*b*) what he openly denies immediately afterward is clearly copied from the Melantius-Calianax conversation in *Maid's Tragedy* (IV, ii);[3] the humorous yet not unfeeling comments in the presence of tragedy at the end by the comic character Selinthus (*Rev. Hon.*, V, p. 447) are like those of Calianax (*M. T.*, V, iv); and the partly comic escape of offenders at the beginning of a new reign is also paralleled in *Maid's Tragedy* (*Rev. Hon.*, IV, p. 442*a*; *M. T.*, V, iv). The attitude of Tarifa toward royalty—openly critical of wrongs and uncringing yet intensely loyal to whoever sat on the imperial throne or was heir apparent—is close to that of Aecius in *Valentinian*, Aubrey in *Bloody Brother*, and (less fully) Amintor in *Maid's Tragedy*. The arousal of Almanzor's suspicions of his son Abilqualit by the story of the people's love for

[1] "When the Emperor's countenance . . . .
Does not cry chink in pocket, no repute is
With mercer, nor with tailor; nay, sometimes, too,
The humour's pregnant in him, when repulse
Is given him by a beauty; I can speak this" (p. 419*a*).

"Apted to the magnificence of his off-spring" (p. 419*a*).

"'Tis fit the prince march. I'ave observed in him, too" (p. 425*a*).

"I'll not conjecture; only I should grieve, sir" (p. 425*a*).

"As we will have him shortly, 't shall go hard else" (p. 432*b*).

"And on this vicious prince, like a fierce sea-breach" (p. 432*a*).

[2] Examples of this: in *Valentinian*, unexpected murder of Maximus by Eudoxia, suicide of Pontius, killing of Valentinian by Phidias and Aretus, and suicide of these two; in *Women Pleased*, discovery that Claudio is Isabella's brother in disguise and that he is not in love with her, but has been putting her chastity to the test; in *Wife for Month*, *Monsieur Thomas*, and other Fletcherian plays there are startling surprises and changes of face of the characters; in *Sp. Curate*, turning out of Bartolus's breakfast to be a hoax, sudden revelation late in the play of Violante's monstrous character, discovery that Jamie's plot to murder his brother is only pretense; in *Women Pleased* (III, ii, p. 188*b*), *Cupid's Rev.* (I, iv), and other Fletcherian plays, whispering of something important, as in *Rev. Hon.* (IV, p. 435*a*), of which the audience learns later.

[3] References to Fletcher's or B. and F.'s plays follow Darley's ed.

him and of their desire to make him king (*Rev. Hon.*, II, p. 424) is precisely the trick used to prejudice the Emperor against Aecius in *Valentinian* (IV, i), and Leontius against his son Leucippus in *Cupid's Revenge* (III, iii). Caropia tells Abilqualit (*Rev. Hon.*, II, p. 429) frankly that it is ambition and a sense of his royal position, as well as her affection, that cause her to give herself up to him; later she submits herself to Abrahen, when he becomes Emperor, though she had refused him her affection so long as he was merely a younger brother of the royal house. Compare with this two speeches of Evadne, the first to Amintor, the second to the King (*M. T.*, II, i, and III, i):

> . . . . it was the folly of thy youth
> To think this beauty . . . .
> . . . . shall stoop to any second.
> I do enjoy the best, and in that height
> Have sworn to stand or die. You guess the man.

and

> I swore, indeed, that I would never love
> A man of lower place; but, if your fortune
> Should throw you from this height, I bade you trust
> I would forsake you, and would bend to him
> That won your throne: I love with my ambition
> Not my eyes.

The presence of stock types in the *dramatis personae* is also characteristic of Fletcher: Selinthus, "an honest merry court lord," Mura, "a rough soldier," Osman, "a captain," Gaselles, "another captain." Compare Soto, "a merry servant" (*Wom. Pl.*), Leontius, "a brave old merry soldier" (*Hum. Lieut.*), Amintor, "a noble gentleman" (*M. T.*), Galatea, "a wise modest lady" (*Philaster*). Of the five types found by Professor Thorndike in each of the B. and F. romances[1]—(*a*) the lovelorn maiden; (*b*) the depraved, shameless woman of the Evadne-Bacha type; (*c*) the loving, noble, generous hero; (*d*) the faithful friend who is also a blunt counselor and brave soldier; and (*e*) the poltroon of the type of Pharamond, Bessus, Timantus—the last four are present in *Revenge for Honour* in the persons of Caropia, Abilqualit, Tarifa, and Mesithes. Only "the lovelorn

[1] *Influence of Beaumont and Fletcher on Shakespeare*, pp. 123, 124.

maiden" is absent, and Thorndike seems to think this type in the romances mainly the work of Beaumont.[1]

Changes from immoral to moral position like that of Abilqualit, or *vice versa*, are also common in Fletcher. Abilqualit has sinned and never repented, yet he is made to appear virtuous and to merit our sympathy. Isabella in *Women Pleased* and Maximus in *Valentinian* are examples of this in plays solely by Fletcher.

In an attempt to prove that Chapman was greatly influenced by the later dramatists, Dr. Stoll[2] has, I think, very clearly shown that *Revenge for Honour* borrowed much from *Cupid's Revenge* (first printed in 1615). His points I have included in quotation marks:

1. "A young prince (Leucippus—Abilqualit) lyingly denies before his father, the King, what would stain the name of the sensual woman he loves (Bacha—Caropia), though prompted to acknowledge the truth by his rough soldier-friend (Ismenus—Tarifa). *Cup. Rev.*, p. 387; *Rev. Hon.*, p. 437 (situation derived originally from the *Arcadia*)."

2. "The pretense urged by the prince's enemy (Timantus—Abrahen) that the prince has plotted against the King's life (*Cup. Rev.*, p. 398; *Rev. Hon.*, p. 438)."

3. "The popular uprising which frees the prince (*Cup. Rev.*, p. 400;[3] *Rev. Hon.*, pp. 438, 446)." A corresponding uprising in a closely corresponding situation takes place in *Val.*, pp. 462, 463. There is also a popular uprising to free Philaster, who like Abilqualit is beloved by the people, natural heir to the throne, and about to be unjustly debarred (*Phil.*, V, iii, pp. 46, 47).

4. "The king his father dies suddenly; in *Rev. Hon.* by poison, as is probably the case in *Cup. Rev.* (it is not clear)."

5. "The prince stabbed by craft, in either case at the very close of the play, by the sensual woman whose honor he had defended." Similarly to Abilqualit, Maximus (in *Val.*, V, viii, p. 465), who

[1] *Influence of Beaumont and Fletcher on Shakespeare*, p. 129.

[2] E. E. Stoll, *John Webster*, Appendix II, p. 213. Dr. Stoll does not question Chapman's authorship of *Rev. Hon.*

[3] G. C. Macaulay in *Francis Beaumont, A Character Study*, p. 85, finds this uprising wholly in Fletcher's style.

has been placed on the throne by popular uprising, meets his death immediately at the hands of the woman whom he has just taken from the deposed emperor.

6. "In his last words the prince, Hamlet-like, names his rough soldier-friend (Tarifa—Ismenus) heir and successor." The end of *Bloody Brother*[1] is also very much like that of *Revenge for Honour:* the concluding speeches have to do with the punishment of the wrongdoers, the reward of the just, and the succession to the vacant throne of the honest, straightforward, and, amid the kaleidoscopic changes, solely constant figure (Tarifa—Aubrey; see p. 10). The last lines of the two plays are much the same in substance:

Selinthus. Long live Tarifa, Caliph of Arabia!
Tarifa. We have no time now for your acclamations;
These are black sorrow's festival. Bear off
In state that royal body; for the other,
Since 'twas his will, let them have burial,
But in obscurity. Be this as it may,
As by an evident rule be understood,
They're only truly great who are truly good.
—*Revenge for Honour*, V, p. 448.

1 Lord. We are ready all to put the honour on you, sir.
Aubrey. These sad rites must be done first. Take up the bodies.
This as he was a prince, so princely funeral
Shall wait on him; on this honest captain,
The decency of arms; a tear for him too.
So, sadly on, and, as we view his blood,
May his example in our rule raise good.
—*Bloody Brother*, V, ii, p. 539.

7. "At the close there is similar Machiavellian cursing on the part of the villain (Bacha—Abrahen) when in the throes of death."

8. "The rough soldier-friend, Tarifa, is a striking imitation of Ismenus, especially in his attitude toward the conflicting interests of the woman (cf. Dion's ruthlessness toward Arethusa for Philaster's sake, III, i, p. 36, and Melantius's toward his sister Evadne for Amintor's; cf. also Leontius in *Hum. Lieut.*, IV, iv, p. 254*b*).

[1] Written, according to Fleay, after 1623. Like some other plays here quoted it is only partly by Fletcher.

Osman also, another captain and friend, is like Ismenus in this respect, uses similar language of ladies in general and this one in particular (*Rev. Hon.*, p. 441*b*; *Cup. Rev.*, p. 402*b*, etc.)."

9. "The contrast and antagonism presented between the points of view of court lords and warriors: Timantus and Ismenus (*Cup. Rev.*, pp. 384, 391, 396; Selinthus and the two captains—Osman and Gaselles, *Rev. Hon.*, pp. 416, 417)."

10. "Fletcherian two-word feminine endings in some number, interesting and lively conduct of plot, a Beaumont and Fletcher levity even at tragic moments (Selinthus, *Rev. Hon.*, p. 447; *Cup. Rev.*, II, v, etc.)."

The proportion of feminine endings in F.'s plays has been treated in greater or less detail by G. C. Macaulay (*Francis Beaumont, A Character Study*), E. F. Oliphant (*Eng. Stud.*, Vol. XIV, p. 57), F. G. Fleay (*T. N. S. S.*, 1874, and *Sh. Manual*), and Robt. Boyle (*Eng. Stud.*, Vol. V). The first two say that two-thirds or more of F.'s lines have this characteristic. Boyle gives for F.'s part of plays written with Beaumont percentages varying from 30.3 per cent. to 47.9 per cent., and for plays written with Massinger, percentages from 52.3 per cent. to 75.9 per cent. Fleay's tables of percentages are not at present accessible to me. Dr. Elste's table[1] gives the percentage of double and triple endings of *Revenge for Honour* as 48.4 per cent. Only in Fletcher or in Massinger at his greatest is so large a percentage to be found among Elizabethan dramatic writers.

The connecting links in incidents and dramatic devices of *Revenge for Honour* to *Cupid's Revenge* are too numerous and close to be explained as accidental. The resemblances to other Fletcherian plays in these respects and in versification are also real and strong. Apparently either the shaping hand of *Revenge for Honour* was that of a gifted and adaptable follower of Fletcher who knew the works of his master well and borrowed the latter's devices and even his substance copiously and imitated his manner successfully, or the shaper of the play was Fletcher himself. The main objections to supposing Fletcher himself to be the author are the infrequency of the Fletcherian verse in its extreme form and the presence of

[1] See p. 7 of this article.

longer and more elaborately developed images than Fletcher customarily used. These objections may be partly explained away in the next section of this paper.

III

As was stated in the beginning, the entry of *Revenge for Honour* in the S. R. ascribed the play to Henry Glapthorne, though the title-page contained the name of George Chapman. Without corroborative evidence of some kind, this entry is of little importance; if, however, other indication may be found that Glapthorne had some connection with the play, the S. R. entry becomes significant. On account of the paucity of contemporary allusion to *Revenge for Honour*, we are forced back on a search for internal evidence.

The date of neither the birth nor the death of Glapthorne is known. His plays were all printed in 1639 and 1640, except *The Lady Mother*, which was for the first time printed in Bullen's *Old English Plays* (1882–86). The composition of Glapthorne's dramatic works is apparently included by the years 1635–40. He is known to have been writing non-dramatic poetry as late as 1643.[1] The following are his plays: (1) *Albertus Wallenstein*, tragedy; (2) *Ladies' Privilege*, comedy with serious plot; (3) *Lady Mother*, comedy with serious plot; (4) *Argalus and Parthenia*, pastoral tragedy; (5) *Hollander*, boisterous comedy of intrigue; (6) *Wit in a Constable*, boisterous comedy of intrigue.

Glapthorne was a better poet than dramatist. His plots are wanting in point and in firmness of structure, and his characterization shows a corresponding want of grasp. Even the best of his plays, *Albertus Wallenstein*, *Ladies' Privilege*, and *Lady Mother*, lack depth, strength, vitality, and genuineness of passion. Judged simply as poetry, however, some of his passages are good: his images are often graceful and felicitous, though likely to be too flowery, or to be overloaded with sentimentality.

In choice and treatment of subject, in dramatic structure and devices, and in character-treatment, no striking resemblance

[1] For all that is known of his life and work, see Mr. A. H. Bullen's article on "Glapthorne" in *Dict. Nat. Biog.*

appears between *Revenge for Honour* and Glapthorne's plays. The disputed play is in general much the superior. The versification is also dissimilar: the main difference is in the much smaller proportion of feminine endings used by Glapthorne. Smoothness, regularity, and a tendency toward monotony distinguish his verse. There is a general similarity between Glapthorne's more serious plays and *Revenge for Honour* in the kind and substance of the images, many of which are taken from nature. The one strong piece of internal evidence, however, in favor of attributing a share in the play to him is the presence in several instances of whole phrases or sentences in *Revenge for Honour* and in one or another of Glapthorne's plays. The following are the most striking parallels that I have noted:

Caropia. The amorous turtles, that at first acquaintance
Strive to express in murmuring notes their loves,
Do when agreed on their affections change
Their chirps to billing.
Abilqualit. And in feather'd arms
Encompass mutually their gaudy necks.
—*Revenge for Honour*, p. 428*b*.

The modest turtles which
In view of other more lascivious birds
Exchange their innocent loves in timorous sighs,
Do when alone most prettily convert
Their chirps to billing; and with feather'd arms
Encompass mutually their gaudy necks.
—*Ladies' Privilege*,[1] p. 99.

Do I think
When I behold the wanton sparrows change
Their chirps to billing, they are chaste?
—*Lady Mother*, I, p. 124.

. . . . a sudden chillness,
Such as the hand of winter casts on brooks,
Thrills our aged heart.
—*Revenge for Honour*, p. 439*a*.

[1] Citations from G.'s plays are taken from Pearson's Reprint except for *Lady Mother*, which is in Vol. II of Bullen's *Old English Plays*.

. . . . with what impudence
Canst thou behold me, and a shivering cold,
Strong as the hand of winter casts on brooks,
Not freeze thy spirits up.

—*Hollander*, II, p. 102.[1]

. . . . he has polluted
By this foul fact my fame, my truth, my goodness,
Strucken through my dignity by his violence:
Nay, started in their peaceful urns, the ashes
Of all my glorious ancestors; defiled
The memory of their still descendent virtues;
Nay, with a killing frost, nipped the fair blossoms
That did presage such goodly fruit arising
From his own hopeful youth.

—*Revenge for Honour*, IV, p. 436*b*.

. . . . suppose
I had with patience borne this scandalous name
Of a degenerate coward, I not only
Had nip'd the budding valor of my youth,
As with a killing frost, but left a shame
Inherent in our family, disgraced
My noble father's memory, defamed,
Nay cowarded my ancestors, whose dust
Would a' broke through the marbles, to avenge
To me this fatal infamy.

—*Ladies' Privilege*, IV, p. 141.

Can you think, sir,
. . . . that when baths of oil
Are poured upon the wild irregular flames,
In populous cities, that they'll then extinguish?

—*Revenge for Honour*, p. 432*a*.

[1]The important point here is that both the image and the diction are parallel. The image itself is fairly common. Compare—

"My soul is shaken with a nipping frost."
—*Alb. Wallenstein*, p. 63.

"I know not what creeps o'er my heart
And leaves a chill beneath it."
—Chapman and Shirley's *Philip Chabot*, p. 542*b*.

I may state that Professor Parrott (who has recently edited *All Fools* and *Gent. Usher* in the "Belles-Lettres Series" and is soon to bring out Chapman's plays complete) tells me he feels sure that the passage containing this image was revised by Shirley. Shirley's *The Brothers* contains a passage somewhat suggestive of this one.

". . . . but death
Hath in few hours made him as stiff as though
The winds of winter had thrown cold upon him."
—Dyce's ed., IV, v, p. 249.

You will rage more than unlimited fire
In populous cities.
—*Ladies' Privilege*, p. 102.

Our progress should be swift,
As is the passage of unlimited fire
In populous cities.
—*Alb. Wallenstein*, p. 31.

Words writ in water have more lasting essence
Than our [women's] determinations.
—*Revenge for Honour*, p. 445*b*.

And let their words, oaths, tears, vows pass
As words in water writ.
—*Argalus and Parthenia*, III, p. 43.

I'll take as little notice
Thou art my offspring as the wandering clouds
Do of the showers, which when they've bred to ripeness
They straight disperse through the vast earth forgotten.
—*Revenge for Honour*, p. 435*b*.

I will quite put off
The name of father, take as little notice
Thou art my offspring, as the surly North
Does of the snow, which when it has engendered
Its wild breath scatters through the earth forgotten.
—*Alb. Wallenstein*, IV, p. 57.

Strongly similar to the figures at the close of these two speeches are those in the following two:

Sir, your words
Are superficial, as a shadow which
The morning sun produces and black night
Renders forgotten.
—*Hollander*, III, p. 122.

. . . . this Emperor . . . . whom we
Will break as showers do bubbles, which themselves
Of nothing had created.
—*Alb. Wallenstein*, II, p. 30.

. . . . be't death,
'T shall be as welcome as sound healthful sleeps
To men oppress'd with sickness.
—*Revenge for Honour*, IV, p. 441*b*.

. . . . death and I are almost now at unity.
—*Ibid.*, V, 448*a*.

. . . . death and I have been
Play-fellows these many years, he'll only bring me
To rest as pleasing to my sense as sleep
After a tedious watching.
—*Ladies' Privilege*, III, p. 133.

Spare my son and I shall go
As willingly to death as to my rest
After a painful child-birth.
—*Lady Mother*, p. 191.

Call back the constant spring into thy cheeks,
That droop like lovely violets o'ercharged
With too much morning's dew; shoot from thy eyes
A thousand flames of joy.
—*Revenge for Honour*, p. 440*b*.

So violent rain weeps o'er the purple heads
Of smiling violets, till its brackish drops
Insinuate among the tender leaves,
And with its weight oppress them.
—*Hollander*, II, p. 108.

Oh, you two
Are clearer, sweeter than the morning dew
Falling in May on lilies. . . . . There doth fly
Immediate comfort from Aminta's eye.
—*Argalus and Parthenia*, p. 26.

These parallels are so striking that they cannot have been accidental. As Mr. Bullen has said,[1] "Anyone who has had the patience to read the plays of Henry Glapthorne cannot fail to be amused by the bland persistence with which certain passages are reproduced in one play after another." This repetition links his plays more or less closely together and establishes a connection of *Revenge for Honour* with them. The hypothesis might be advanced that Glapthorne simply borrowed these passages from *Revenge for Honour*. Such an hypothesis, however, is, as I have just shown, unnecessary; it is also unlikely on the face of it, as *Revenge for Honour*, though very possibly written many years earlier, was first printed in 1654, long after the writing of all and the printing of all except one of Glapthorne's plays. Or if we suppose that *Revenge for Honour* was written later than Glapthorne's

[1] *Old Eng. Plays*, Vol. II, p. 101.

plays, it is absurd to think that any writer other than Glapthorne would have written a drama containing scattering borrowings of this kind from all of the latter's dramatic works. It may, I think, be taken as proved that Glapthorne had a hand in the final shaping of *Revenge for Honour*.

By way of recapitulation and conclusion, I will state my hypothesis of the composition and publication of the play. In the first place it seems rather probable that *Revenge for Honour* is to be identified with *The Parracide* of 1624. At any rate, it was written in the Fletcherian manner, either by an apt and gifted pupil of Fletcher working strongly under the influence and perhaps with the assistance[1] of the master, or possibly by Fletcher himself. Of the success or failure of the play on the stage nothing is known. Marriot's entry of *Revenge for Honour* with ascription to Glapthorne and publication under the name of Chapman may be variously explained. Glapthorne may have been employed to correct real or supposed profaneness or indecency in the expression—a step not at all uncommon at that time—or to fill in *lacunae* caused by injury or illegibility, or he may have possessed himself independently of the manuscript, worked it over sufficiently to establish some claim to its authorship, and then sold it to Marriot. The latter's decision to use Chapman's name instead of Glapthorne's on the title-page was probably due to the availability of Chapman's name for advertising purposes, perhaps reinforced by the knowledge that Glapthorne after all was only part author or by an erroneous tradition that Chapman really had a hand in the play.

D. L. THOMAS

LAWRENCE, KANSAS
September 16, 1907

[1] This point was suggested to me recently by Mr. Fleay, after he had heard a summary of this paper.

PB
1
M7
v.5

Modern philology

PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE
CARDS OR SLIPS FROM THIS POCKET

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY